

MUNDARI GRAMMAR.

~~114~~
~~3782~~

BY

THE REV. J. HOFFMANN, S.J.,

CATHOLIC MISSION, CHOTA NAGPUR.

23432

495.955
Hof



CALCUTTA:

BENGAL SECRETARIAT PRESS.

1903.

[Price—Indian, Rs. 4; English, 6s.]

D 2427
80

Published at the BENGAL SECRETARIAT BOOK DEPÔT
Writers' Buildings, Calcutta.

—♦—
OFFICIAL AGENTS.

In India—

MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & Co., Calcutta and
Simla.
MESSRS. NEWMAN & Co., Calcutta.
MESSRS. HIGGINBOTHAM & Co., Madras.
MESSRS. THACKER & Co., LD., Bombay.
MESSRS. A. J. COMBRIDGE & Co., Bombay.
THE SUPERINTENDENT, AMERICAN BAPTIST
MISSION PRESS, Rangoon.
MRS. RADHABAI ATMARAM SAGOON, Bombay.
MESSRS. R. CAMBRAY & Co., Calcutta.
MESSRS. S. K. LAHIRI & Co., Printers and
Book-sellers, College Street, Calcutta.
RAI SAHIB M. GULAB SINGH & SONS, Proprie-
tors of the Mufid-i-am Press, Lahore, Punjab.
MESSRS. V. KALYANARAM IYER & Co.,
Book-sellers, &c., Madras.
MESSRS. D. B. TARAPOREVALA, SONS & Co.,
Book-sellers, Bombay.
MESSRS. G. A. NATESON & Co., Madras.
MESSRS. A. W. HAMILTON & Co., 11 Edmond-
stone Road, Allahabad.

In England—

MR. E. A. ARNOLD, 37 Bedford Street, Strand,
London.
MESSRS. CONSTABLE & Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens,
London.
MESSRS. SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON & Co., St.
Dunstan's House, Fetter Lane, London.
MESSRS. LUZAG & Co., 46 Great Russell Street,
London.
MESSRS. KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.,
Charing Cross Road, London.
MR. B. ALFRED QUARITCH, 15 Piccadilly,
London.
MESSRS. P. S. KING & SON, 2 & 4 Great Smith
Street, Westminster, London.
MESSRS. H. S. KING & Co., 65 Cornhill,
London.
MESSRS. WILLIAMS AND NORGATE, Oxford.
MESSRS. DEIGHTON BELL & Co., Cambridge.

On the Continent—

MESSRS. R. FRIEDLÄNDER & SOHN, Berlin, N.
W. Carlstrasse, 11.
MR. OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, Leipzig.
MR. KARL HIERSEMANN, Leipzig.
MR. ERNEST LEROUX, 28 Rue Bonaparte, Paris.
MR. MARTINUS NIJHOFF, The Hague.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

	Page.
Mundari vowels and consonants	1
Article—definite and indefinite	5
Gender	5
Number—Grammatical	7
Formation of—	8
Demonstratives— I.—Definite	9
II.—Indefinite	10
III.—Interrogative	11
Pronouns— I.—Simple personal	12
II.—Emphatic personal	16
III.—Definite demonstrative	23
IV.—Indefinite	23
V.—Definite interrogative	30
VI.—Indefinite interrogative	31
Postpositions	33
Numerals— I.—Cardinal	64
II.—Distributive	65
III.—Ordinal	67
IV.—Proportional	67
Adverbs— I.—Of place	70
II.—Of quantity	75
III.—Of manner	76
IV.—Of time	9
Conjunctions	80
Interjections	83
Emphatic, dubitative and corrective suffixes	84

PART II.

Equivalents of declensions	86
Possessive adjectives and their suffixes	98
Possessive pronouns	103
Adjectives	108
Degrees of comparison	110

PART III.

Equivalents of conjugational forms	113
Voice	130
Mood	131
Tenses	133
Passive voice	152
Reflexive voice	155
Reciprocal voice	157
Origin and meaning of tense suffixes	162
Imperative mood	166
Precative, concessive or optative	166
Formation of compounds	183

PART IV.

Subordinate clauses, relative, conditional, etc.	201
Examples and idioms	215

APPENDIX.

- I.—The Azur legend with a literal translation.
- II.—Description of cultivation and of the Mundas' ordinary day's work, as written by a Munda.
- III.—Specimen of a Mundari story.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF CONTENTS.

AN INTRODUCTION

SHOWING THE STRUCTURAL OUTLINES OF MUNDARI AND POINTING
OUT THE MORE STRIKING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN KHOLARIAN
AND ARYAN LANGUAGES.

MUNDARI, Santhali, and Ho are the chief among the surviving Kholarian dialects. They do not differ much from each other. The Koroas, Asurs, and Birhors, as well as some other numerically insignificant tribes, also speak Kholarian dialects.

Mundari is chiefly spoken in the southern and western parts of the Ranchi district and in the north of Singhbhum.

The terms *Munda* and *Mundari* are used by foreigners only to designate the Kholarians of the Ranchi district and their language.

The Mundas call themselves *Horo*: *the Men*, and their language, *Horo Kaji*: *the Man-language*, or simply *Horo*. *Mundari* is a Hindi and English Adjective which is never used by the Mundas themselves. With them the word *Munda* means a landed proprietor or a rich man. Again, every Munda village is divided into two *khunts* or classes—the Munda *khunt* and the Pahar *khunt*. The head of the Munda *khunt* is the civil chief of the village, whereas the head of the Pahar *khunt* is the religious chief or sacrificer. Hence in Mundari the word *Munda* is used (1) to distinguish landed proprietors from mere tenants or raiyats; (2) to denote the village chief; (3) to distinguish the members of the Munda *khunt* from those of the Pahar *khunt*.

The vocabulary and especially the structure of Kholarian dialects show that these languages are by no means as closely related to the Dravidian languages as they have, by some writers, been supposed to be, nor do they seem to stand closer, genealogically speaking, to any of the other non-Aryan languages of India. Until comparative philology has accomplished for that vast number of non-Aryan and non-Semitic languages what it has done for the Aryan and Semitic families, it will hardly be possible to ascertain the exact *genealogical position* of Kholarian speech.

From the purely *morphological* or *structural point of view*, the case is of course quite different, for the grammar of any language shows at once to what class or group it belongs.

Morphologically languages are divisible into three great groups—the *Isolating*, the *Agglutinative*, and the *Organic* or *Flexiona language*.

In an Isolating language (Chinese) every root constitutes a complete word with a meaning of its own, and undergoes no phonetic change when in contact with other roots: hence complex ideas, such, *v. gr.*, as are signified by the various forms of our declensions and conjugations, are here expressed by the mere juxtaposition of perfectly independent roots. Consequently a different arrangement or grouping of the same unaltered and unalterable elements will yield phrases and propositions of totally different meanings.

Organic languages.—(1) In these the *current words* are no longer *bare original roots*. Even such monosyllables as the Latin word *lex* or the English *law* are compounds of at least two original roots.

(2) In these compounds there is no such thing as mere juxtaposition of independent roots, but there is a real *subordination* of one or more *secondary* roots to one *primary* root. The primary root denotes a certain general idea, and the secondary roots are grouped around it according to fixed laws and subordinated to it for the purpose of variously specifying or modifying that general idea. Hence these secondary roots are also called *the formative elements*.

Thus in *lex*, *legislator*, *eligo*, *praelego*, -s, *islator*, *e*, -o, *pra-o* are so many *formative elements* which determine the *de facto* meaning of one and the same primary root *lec*. They are in a real subordination to the primary root, for we cannot change their position in any of the above words without destroying it as a Latin word: *lec-s* is a Latin word, whereas *s-lec* means nothing any more.

(3) The roots thus concurring to form words react on each other according to fixed phonetic laws, so that both *the primary* as well as *the secondary* roots become liable to changes in their original form. These changes are visible not only through the different languages of the same family, but also in the various forms of a given compound in the same language. *Cfr.*, *lex*, *loi*, *law*, *lego*, *lire*, *lisant*, *lu*. In all of these the original primary root is *lec*.

(4) In the secondary roots especially the changes caused by the phonetic laws are so great that the original form of these roots is generally quite mutilated. They dwindle down to mere terminations, inflexions or vowel and consonantal changes, which have no longer any meaning at all if detached from the word they concurred to form.

Cfr., the Case-endings of Nouns and the Personal pronominal desinences of Verbs, and in fact nearly all the formative elements of Organic words. It even happens that some secondary roots disappear entirely from a compound, although the particular function for which they were originally affixed to a primary root still continues to live. Thus *lego* still means *I read*, yet there is no trace of a personal pronominal desinence left in *lego*. The phonetic laws presiding over the formation of Organic words, and therefore over the whole development or growth of Organic languages, constantly tend to weaken strong forms and to grind down formative elements. The effect of this tendency is generally called *phonetic decay*. Hence we say that the phonetic interdependence of the component elements must always leave full play to the phonetic decay of primary as well as secondary roots through the various branches of the same family. Organic words may therefore in a certain sense be called real *combinations* of originally distinct complete roots into a new *totum*, even as distinct atoms combine to form molecules. Though these roots be really in the combination or compound word as far as *their functions* are concerned, yet their *original forms* can no longer be ascertained without the aid of philological analysis.

The *Agglutinative languages* stand midway between the Isolating and the Organic groups.

(1) In these, as in the Isolating languages, bare roots may be complete words.

(2) But when it becomes necessary to use two or several roots together for the purpose of expressing a complex idea, then these languages adopt a process differing from that used by either the Organic or the Isolating language: the roots concurring to form a word are neither completely *independent* of each other nor yet so *interdependent* as to phonetically react on each other to any great extent. In other words, there is neither mere *co-ordination* of completely independent roots nor is there such a degree of mutual dependence as to produce a *reciprocal reaction* with its consequent blending as it were of various elements into one organic whole. But there is, in these compound words, an *attraction* exercised by the *primary* on the *secondary roots*. The latter stand to the primary root in the relation of *prefixes* or *suffixes* or *infixes*. These secondary roots, to accommodate themselves to the primary, will submit to some vowel or consonant changes, or even to partial mutilation. But

they seem to do so only reluctantly, and as if trying to preserve their original form as far as possible. The primary root, however, sacrifices nothing to the secondary roots. It always preserves its original form intact. The following may serve to illustrate this:—*dal* is a bare root meaning to strike; *dal-me!* do strike! *dal-tanae*: he strikes; *dal-kedae*: he struck; *dal-oae*: he will be struck; *dal-entanae*: he strikes himself; *dal-keni*: the one who struck. In these languages, therefore, phonetic decay is restricted to the secondary roots. They left the Isolating stage the moment they began that incipient subordination of secondary to primary roots, which has just been described. They begin to enter the Organic stage the moment they allow the secondary roots to react phonetically on the primary root. There is little if any doubt that the Organic languages have passed through the Agglutinative stage. By far the greater number of the world's languages are still in this stage. Their one common feature is the preservation of the form of primary roots. In many other respects they differ widely from each other. Thus, in some the secondary roots are for the most part *prefixed*, whilst in others they are *suffixes*; in some the secondary roots undergo comparatively strong changes, whilst in others they hardly suffer any change; in some the so-called law of *the harmony of vowels* reigns supreme, whereas in others we hardly find any traces of it; in some the order of words in the proposition is the reverse of what it is in others; in some, again, Parts of Speech are recognisable as such by some permanent prefix, suffix or infix, whereas in others the context in which a bare root occurs, will alone show what function the word actually performs in a given proposition. In a word, some Agglutinative languages approach more closely to the Organic stage, whilst others are still far removed from it.

The Kholarian dialects, though now spoken only by a few numerically insignificant tribes, are in several respects a very interesting and remarkable specimen of the Agglutinative group.

Before entering on the details of Mundari Grammar, I think it advisable to first describe the great outlines of the language. This will show that neither the method nor the whole of the terminology of Organic grammars can be applied successfully to Mundari, or, for the matter of that, to any Agglutinative language.

If the Kholarians had, before the Aryan invasion, attained any civilisation worth the name, traces of that civilisation would no doubt be met with in their language. However, both the number and kind of Mundari words, as well as the manner in which those words are handled, seem to show that neither civilisation nor intellectual activity have so far exercised any marked influence on the language.

NUMBER AND KIND OF MUNDARI WORDS.

Ever since the Mundas retreated before the Aryan invaders into the forests of the Chota Nagpur plateau, they have lived in the most rigorous seclusion. A deep aversion for their former conquerors constantly repelled all that civilisation and thought which have existed for centuries around them among the Hindu and Mussulman populations. Though they live in the land which is reputed the birth-place of the art of writing, their language as well as that of other Kholarians remained unwritten and altogether unknown beyond the limits of the small woody mountainous tracts they occupied. It was only towards the second half of the last century that Mundari and Sonthali were written by Missionaries,—the one in Hindi and the other in Bengali characters. Even at the present day the Mundas generally disdain every trade or art. That they were once keen hunters may be inferred from the obligatory yearly hunts in which every boy and grown-up man of the village must join if he wants his name to be remembered by the Singbonga (Sungod), as well as from the *era sendera* (the women's hunt), which is proclaimed after stated cycles of years. In this *era sendera* the women don the men's clothes, and carrying the men's arms raid the neighbouring villages. Any goats, sheep, pigs or fowls they meet outside the houses on that occasion are their legitimate prey, if they succeed in cutting them down. The Mundas still prefer the forest to the cultivated country. To carry on a cultivation of the most rudimentary kind in clearances made by themselves, and lead an idle, improvident life cheered by nightly dances to the sound of the *dumang* (a deep-toned drum), and by as much intoxicating rice-beer as they can procure, seems to be their highest ideal of life. Hence names of trades, products, and implements belonging to a somewhat advanced culture are not to be met with in the purely Mundari vocabulary. Their list of words denoting concrete objects is therefore exhausted by that part of the *fauna* and *flora* which interests the hunter and tiller, and by names of places, objects, and implements of practical value and use in a life of

the simplest kind. Even the rudimentary plough now in common use has got a Hindi name.

The number of words exclusively denoting forms of activity, such as our Verbs and certain of our Abstract Nouns, is by no means as large as we might expect it to be. For (1) all such forms of activity as belong exclusively to a higher culture have no names in Mundari, for the simple reason that they are unknown. (2) Purely intellectual forms of activity have received but scanty attention, and even that little throws a peculiar light on the pleasure they would seem to take in the exercise of our noblest faculties. *Urú* denotes sadness and gloom. It means also to be sad, to be gloomy. At the same time it is the only word they have to denote *thought* or to say that *they are thinking*. (3) Every Mundari word may, without undergoing any change of its original form, be used with the function of a Verb. Thus *orá* means *house*. It also means *to make a house, to settle down in a certain place or village*. *Uri* means *bullock*. It may also be used to denote *the acquisition of cattle*. *Aiar* means *ahead*. Hence it also means *to advance*. Thus, then, while we have, besides our Nouns, Adjectives, etc., a distinct set of words to denote forms of activity, viz., Verbs, the Munda simply uses the existing roots denoting persons, animals, objects or relations, with a transitive or intransitive function, and thereby considerably reduces the size of his vocabulary.

Their religious system is neither very clear nor homogeneous. It is made up of three distinct cults: the worship of *Sing-bonga*, *ancestor-worship*, and the cult of certain minor deities, called simply *bongako*. These seem to be local deities worshipped by former aborigines, who were partly destroyed, partly crowded out by the Mundas.

I.—The Worship of Sing-bonga.—*Sing* is one of the current words for *day*; *singi* means *the sun*. It would appear from certain expressions that formerly the word *bonga* was used to denote *the moon* and perhaps also *the sun*. Now the Hindi word *chand*, Mundarized into *chandú*, is used to signify *the moon*. The word *bonga* is now entirely restricted to denote all those spirits who are believed to have power or influence over the destinies of man. As such it may be added to the name of any deity. If used alone, it always signifies only the minor or local deities.

The word *Sing-bonga* therefore literally means the *Sun-god*, or the spirit of light. Whereas the minor deities are considered as spiteful and as the immediate causes of all kinds of sickness and misfortune, the

Sing-bonga is conceived as essentially kind and good. He is entitled to a daily cult or *adoration*, which consists in a respectful greeting every morning at sunrise. I have heard the complaint that in these days of legal strife and coolie-trade the Mundas have become very remiss in this practice. The *soka* or soothsayer advises occasionally to sacrifice a fowl or a goat to *Sing-bonga*. Those fowls or goats must be *white*. That the *Sing-bonga* is conceived as *personal* and as *distinct* from the orb of the sun appears from the following points of belief still common among the Mundas: (1) He has made the sun as well as everything else; (2) He is invisible; (3) Though believed to be chiefly residing in the sun, he is everywhere—"in the four corners of the world and in the four worlds;" (4) He directs everything; (5) He is the *Maranguterni*, i.e., the utterly great or the supreme one; (6) All the other *bongas* are not only inferior to him, but they have been made *bongas* by him; (7) In great misfortunes the first instinctive complaint is generally addressed to him: *Hela Sing-bonga! Chikanamentem enkajáña? Hela Singbonga!* Why dost thou treat me thus? (8) In solemn asseverations he is called on as a witness by the words: *Hant lejáiña!* or *Hant ituanæ!* Yonder One sees me! or Yonder One knows! (9) When the cause of some sickness is enquired into by the *soka* or *deponran* (soothsayer), the *Sing-bonga* is first called upon as the *All-knowing* to reveal the name of the particular *bonga* who requires propitiation.

II.—*Ancestor-worship*.—This is still deeply rooted in the Kholarian mind. It seems to be a cult they brought with them when they retreated into Chota Nagpur and the adjacent hilly tracts, and one which they probably had already when they entered India. The fact that the present system of private and public sacrifices to the local deities or *bongas* has pushed ancestor-worship somewhat to the background and reduced it almost entirely to a domestic cult has caused the notices so far written about these tribes to under-estimate or overlook altogether this distinctly Kholarian cult.

The Mundas say that formerly they burnt their dead, but that now they have adopted the practice of burying from their Christian fellow-Mundas. The first disposal of dead bodies is, as it were, only provisional and outside the religious observance; for they have a special burial feast once a year, which is called *Jang-tōpa*,—Burial of bones. After burning a body the remaining bones were gathered into a small earthen vessel and kept in the *ading*. The *ading* is a side-room in the hut or house, in which the spirits of the deceased are believed to reside. It is also used as a store-room. On the *Jang-tōpa* feast these bones are with

some ceremonies placed under the horizontal stone-slabs, which are invariably met with in or near every Munda village. If the deceased were first buried, then either some bones are dug out or some earth is taken from the recent grave and placed similarly under the slabs at the *Jang-tōpa* feast. On that day all the villagers, though they may not have any remains to dispose of that year, turn out and anoint the burial slabs with oil in honour of their ancestors. Those stone slabs are called *sasan-dirī*. Members of the village family who may have settled in other villages as mere tenants bury their dead provisionally in their actual place of residence. But on the *Jang-tōpa* day they carry the remains to their ancestral village to be there placed under the common *sasandiris*. It is only when emigrants have acquired land enough to found a separate hamlet or village that they will place slabs in their new home and observe the yearly burial day there. In honour of prominent men, and, as I have been told, in memory of some people who have been carried off by tigers, upright stone slabs of sometimes considerable height are erected in or near the village. These are called *bid-dirī*.

The *sasan-diris* are not only religious monuments: they serve, also as proofs of membership in the village family, and therefore as a sort of title-deed to partnership in the village property. Hence the saying: *Sasandiriko Mundakoi pata*, —The burial slabs are the Mundas' title-deeds. None but a real or formally-adopted member of the village family would ever be allowed to place a *sasan-dirī* in the village. Remains of children who have died before the age of reason are buried under some tree near the village and left there. Women dying in child-birth are buried as far away as possible from the village, near some stream. They are believed to turn into ghosts, called *churin*, who always want to come back and haunt the house. To prevent them from doing so, long thorns are driven into the soles of their feet just before the burial. All other members of the village family, whether men, women or children, receive the customary burial honours, are accounted among the *Ancestors*, *Haramko*, and have a share in the Ancestor-worship.

Some two or three days after the death of any person entitled to Ancestor-worship, the rite of recalling the deceased's soul or spirit to the house is performed. This rite is called *Umbul-āder*, —The taking or bringing in of the shade. The ceremonies are briefly as follows:—

In the evening two persons remaining in the house of the deceased place some food in a leaf-cup, strew the floor with ashes, and then close

the house-door. Meanwhile the villagers go to the place where the deceased was burnt or lies buried. There one man addresses the *shade* or spirit of deceased as follows: "Here we have come to call thee back to the house; thou hast now been long enough in the chill and the cold!" A silent procession is then formed towards the house. During the progress two ploughshares are at short intervals struck against each other. Arrived at the house, the speaker, on behalf of the *shade*, asks that the door be opened to him. A short dialogue ensues, during which the two persons inside express misgivings regarding the intentions and character of him who seeks admission. When the *shade* has satisfied them the door is opened. Then the floor and the leaf-cup are examined. The slightest trace of real or imaginary disturbance in the ashes on the floor or the food in the leaf-cup is considered as a proof that the *shade* has taken his abode permanently in the *ading* with the *ancestors*. If no traces at all can be found, the whole process is gone through a second and sometimes even a third time. If after that no real or imaginary traces are found, they resign themselves, saying that the *shade* must be dissatisfied with something or another, and has probably taken up his abode in some tree or stone.

These *shades* are often called *Orá-bongako*, *house spirits*. None of the other *bongas* (local deities) ever enter a Munda's house.

Like the *Singbonga*, the *Orá-bongako* or *shades* of the *ancestors*, are entitled to a *daily cult*. Before every meal the Mundas drop a few grains of rice on the ground as an offering to the *Orá-bongako*. Similarly, a few drops of rice-beer must be allotted to the *shades* before the living put the cup to their own lips.

Besides this there is every year a special feast in honour of the *ancestors*, viz., the *Bá-parob* or *Flower feast*. It is preceded by a vigil, which is a strict fast-day. On the feast itself the head of the family offers a sacrifice of fish, pulse, and fine rice to the *shades* in the *ading*. He alone partakes of the dainty meal; then sticking a *sâl-tree* blossom over his ear he turns to the family and says: *Mar nádo báanpe! Now then adorn yourselves with flowers!* Immediately everybody sticks *sâl-tree* blossoms in his hair; garlands of the same flowers are hung about the house, and the feast commences with banqueting and winds up with a dance, which lasts the whole night through.

The *Orá-bongako* are also believed to cause in others (chiefly) that particular sickness of which they themselves died. The sacrifices of propitiation consist of cooked rice, pulse, fish, flowers, a black fowl, or red goat, and sometimes a bullock. This last item shows that the

shades of the Mundas have not allowed themselves to be *Hinduized* out of their taste for cow-flesh. All the local deities, except the *Baranda Buru Bonga*, a Mahali deity, do not accept offerings of cow-flesh.

Munda girls always marry out of their village in another *kili*. Now it happens sometimes that one of her own *Oṛabongako* follows her on the road to her new home, and staying somewhere on that road causes the newly-married person to get frequently sick until she with her husband returns some evening along that road and there at some spot both offer a sacrifice, asking that particular shade to return home and leave the girl unmolested. Such *shades* are called *Horatenkoā bonga*,—Spirits of those who wander, i.e., leave home.

III.—The local deities.

(1) *The Nage ɛrako, the wives of the Nages or Azurs*.—The myth relating to the origin of these *bongas* is given in an appendix. It is strongly tinged with Hindu notions. The *caste* of the birds, the term *bejait* for *outcast*, the exclusion of cows and bullocks from the list of sacrificial animals, the *incarnation* of Singbonga, the introduction of a wife of Singbonga, and the division of the village family into a civil and sacerdotal class, viz., Munda-Khunt and Pahanṛ-Khunt, are so many distinct Hindu features. Hinduism has, nevertheless, been unable to destroy or even deeply modify the original Kholarian religion, and it has had practically no influence on their social system: that *female Singbonga* of the legend has never succeeded in getting any official recognition. Not only has she no trace of a cult, but she has not even got a name. She exists only in that one passage of the Azur legend. The division of the village into a civil and sacerdotal *Khunt*, though accepted, is in no respect either as deep or as thoroughgoing as it is in the Brahmanic system; for it creates neither social nor religious privileges. There is absolutely no trace of caste-distinctions or social exclusiveness between Mundas and Pahanṛs. The marriage law rests still exclusively on the original custom of not marrying within one's own *kili*; nor are there any *sacred* lands allotted to the Pahanṛs on the ground of their sacerdotal character. Whatever lands they hold are theirs simply by the ordinary Munda law of inheritance. Again, the man who is now Pahanṛ may, on account of circumstances, become Munda and *vice versa*. Sometimes one and the same person is both Munda and Pahanṛ. It is only in villages from which the Mundas have been crowded out by Urans or Hinduized aborigines that the superstition of the new owners tries to retain a Pahanṛ of the Munda race, because they believe them more able to propitiate the local deities. In such

villages a special grant of lands, going by various names, is made to the Pahanr. In purely Mundari villages the patriarchal system is still in full force, viz., the head of each family is the high priest or sacrificer for all the needs of the family. The work of the Pahanr as such is limited to a few public sacrifices on behalf of the whole village at fixed periods or festivals.

Though the *bongas* are stated by the legend to have been the women-folk of the exterminated Azurs, they are not now considered as female deities : they are simple *bongas* or *spirits*. Finally, the word *Doisa Nagar* stamps the legend as comparatively recent.

These local deities are not entitled to a *daily* worship like the *Singbonga* and the *Shades of the Ancestors*. Their cult consists of eight public sacrifices offered by the Pahanr for the success of the ploughing, sowing, weeding, reaping and threshing operations, for a successful hunt in the month of *Phagun* (February-March), and to celebrate a particularly unclean festival called *Mage-parob* (January-February).

Besides these public sacrifices, the head of a family afflicted with sickness offers an occasional propitiatory sacrifice to some particular *bonga*, who is either suspected by himself or pointed out by the *soka* as the cause of the sickness.

(2) *The Baranda Buru bonga*.—This is a deity of the Mahali tribe. He has no feast. Recourse is had to him only in cases of child-birth. Unlike the preceding class of *bongas*, he accepts sacrifices of bullocks.

(3) *The Pangruabonga*.—Though supposed to reside in a pond caused by a waterfall near the Pangrua village, some 12 miles south of Khunti, he has no cult among the Mundas except in the three villages closest to his residence. But the Larka Khol of Kholan worship him.

(4) *The Aun Disum bonga* or *Disum bonga*.—He has no feast and no worship among the Mundas, but is considered a spirit who stuck to the country even after the above-mentioned local deities had occupied it.

The Karam-Kahani, or the story of *Karma* and *Dharma*, though given sometimes as a *Mundari* legend, is unknown to those Mundas who live still secluded from other races ; so are the rites and sacrifices based on that story. The *Karam* is the principal religious feast of what appear to be Hinduised aborigines and of the Uraons. No Mundas, except those who live scattered among other tribes, observe the *Karam* feast.

The word *ondoka* signifies a minister of human sacrifices. These *ondokas* are supposed to be chiefly emissaries of wealthy Hindu

shades of the Mundas have not allowed themselves to be *Hinduized* out of their taste for cow-flesh. All the local deities, except the *Baranda Buru Bonga*, a Mahali deity, do not accept offerings of cow-flesh.

Munda girls always marry out of their village in another *kili*. Now it happens sometimes that one of her own *Orábongako* follows her on the road to her new home, and staying somewhere on that road causes the newly-married person to get frequently sick until she with her husband returns some evening along that road and there at some spot both offer a sacrifice, asking that particular shade to return home and leave the girl unmolested. Such *shades* are called *Horatenkoá bonga*,—Spirits of those who wander, *i.e.*, leave home.

III.—The local deities.

(1) *The Nage erako, the wives of the Nages or Azurs.*—The myth relating to the origin of these *bongas* is given in an appendix. It is strongly tinged with Hindu notions. The *caste* of the birds, the term *bejait* for *outcast*, the exclusion of cows and bullocks from the list of sacrificial animals, the *incarnation* of Singbonga, the introduction of a wife of Singbonga, and the division of the village family into a civil and sacerdotal class, *viz.*, Munda-Khunt and Pahanr-Khunt, are so many distinct Hindu features. Hinduism has, nevertheless, been unable to destroy or even deeply modify the original Kholarian religion, and it has had practically no influence on their social system: that *female Singbonga* of the legend has never succeeded in getting any official recognition. Not only has she no trace of a cult, but she has not even got a name. She exists only in that one passage of the Azur legend. The division of the village into a civil and sacerdotal *Khunt*, though accepted, is in no respect either as deep or as thoroughgoing as it is in the Brahmanic system; for it creates neither social nor religious privileges. There is absolutely no trace of caste-distinctions or social exclusiveness between Mundas and Pahanrs. The marriage law rests still exclusively on the original custom of not marrying within one's own *kili*; nor are there any *sacred* lands allotted to the Pahanrs on the ground of their sacerdotal character. Whatever lands they hold are theirs simply by the ordinary Munda law of inheritance. Again, the man who is now Pahanr may, on account of circumstances, become Munda and *vice versa*. Sometimes one and the same person is both Munda and Pahanr. It is only in villages from which the Mundas have been crowded out by Uraons or Hinduized aborigines that the superstition of the new owners tries to retain a Pahanr of the Munda race, because they believe them more able to propitiate the local deities. In such

villages a special grant of lands, going by various names, is made to the Pahanr. In purely Mundari villages the patriarchal system is still in full force, viz., the head of each family is the high priest or sacrificer for all the needs of the family. The work of the Pahanr as such is limited to a few public sacrifices on behalf of the whole village at fixed periods or festivals.

Though the *bongas* are stated by the legend to have been the women-folk of the exterminated Azurs, they are not now considered as female deities : they are simple *bongas* or *spirits*. Finally, the word *Doisa Nagar* stamps the legend as comparatively recent.

These local deities are not entitled to a *daily* worship like the *Singbonga* and the *Shades of the Ancestors*. Their cult consists of eight public sacrifices offered by the Pahanr for the success of the ploughing, sowing, weeding, reaping and threshing operations, for a successful hunt in the month of *Phagun* (February-March), and to celebrate a particularly unclean festival called *Mage-parob* (January-February).

Besides these public sacrifices, the head of a family afflicted with sickness offers an occasional propitiatory sacrifice to some particular *bonga*, who is either suspected by himself or pointed out by the *soka* as the cause of the sickness.

(2) *The Baranda Buru bonga*.—This is a deity of the Mahali tribe. He has no feast. Recourse is had to him only in cases of child-birth. Unlike the preceding class of *bongas*, he accepts sacrifices of bullocks.

(3) *The Pangruabonga*.—Though supposed to reside in a pond caused by a waterfall near the Pangrua village, some 12 miles south of Khunti, he has no cult among the Mundas except in the three villages closest to his residence. But the Larka Khol of Kholan worship him.

(4) *The Aur Disum bonga* or *Disum bonga*.—He has no feast and no worship among the Mundas, but is considered a spirit who stuck to the country even after the above-mentioned local deities had occupied it.

The Karam-Kahani, or the story of *Karma* and *Dharma*, though given sometimes as a *Mundari* legend, is unknown to those Mundas who live still secluded from other races ; so are the rites and sacrifices based on that story. The *Karam* is the principal religious feast of what appear to be Hinduised aborigines and of the Uraons. No Mundas, except those who live scattered among other tribes, observe the *Karam* feast.

The word *ondoka* signifies a minister of human sacrifices. These *ondokas* are supposed to be chiefly emissaries of wealthy Hindu

zamindars. It is said, however, that certain Mundas, Uraons, and others do not shrink from occasional human sacrifices. The belief in the existence of sacrificers of this kind is so universal and so deeply rooted that almost every year, especially at sowing time, rumours of real or attempted human sacrifices run through the country and spread such terror in out-of-the way places that people keep a close watch over their children, and that even grown-up men dare not venture alone on a journey through lonely spots.

The word *nájom* denotes a wizard or more frequently a witch who can in various ways excite some *bonga* against this or that family or individual. The *nájom* is said to eat the life or soul of his victim. The *soka* is applied to for the purpose of discovering *nájoms*. Formerly they used to suspend wizards and witches to a branch of a high tree and roast them to death slowly by means of a fire kindled under the tree. Hardly a village can be found where there is not a house suspected or convicted of witchcraft by the *soka*. The social position of these poor people becomes exceedingly difficult. They are *chilan*, i.e., precluded from eating or drinking with the other villagers sometimes for years and years; and when first pointed out by the *soka* they are invariably fined to furnish the animals for expiatory sacrifices, and generally they have to undergo a certain amount of bodily ill-treatment. They are sometimes altogether expelled from the village, and even now-a-days they do not always escape with their lives.

The numberless superstitions and their theories about dreams need not be mentioned here, as they do not give rise to special words. Boulders of limestone are believed to be the bones of fiendish proud giants, called *raksha*. The word is evidently not a Mundari one.

The little the Mundas have of popular stories is singularly devoid of bright imagination and ideality, and therefore, linguistically so to say, valueless. The Hindi word *kahani* is the only existing equivalent for *story*. Distinctively Kholarian accounts of the origin of man and of the great flood are exceedingly meagre and do not enrich the vocabulary of the language.

Dalton gives the following as a Kholarian version :—

“The first man and woman were placed in a delightful valley and lived there in great simplicity. It was only when their creator descended and taught them the art of making *izi* (intoxicating rice-beer) that they began to get offspring.”

Instead of the deluge they speak of a rain of fire which long ago destroyed everything living except a brother and sister, who were both

blind. These two getting drunk one day on rice-beer got offspring and became the parents of the present human race.

This unsavory detail of drunkenness met with in both these accounts throws an unfavourable light on the *reputed* simplicity of the race. That *simplicity* as well as the *reputed truthfulness* of the Kholas are two myths, which only show how rash it is for mere tourists or even temporary residents to rush into print with interesting ethnographical notes about races whose languages they do not understand and of whose customs and real inner life they could not possibly have acquired any but the most superficial knowledge.

Words which, like our Adjectives, denote qualities concretely, are not very numerous.

(1) For the purely moral qualities there are hardly any words: such Adjectives as *constant, generous, faithful, courageous, discreet, pious, abstemious, modest*, etc., have no equivalents in Mundari. It would, however, be wrong to conclude from this that the Mundas have no ethical perceptions, for they have words to denote the corresponding moral deformities or vices. They will say that a man is *miserly, deceitful, crafty, spiteful, jealous, dishonest, lazy*, and the like. All these deficiencies have struck them as morally wrong: they are all *et'kan*, i.e., *bad*. But they have so far not given any serious attention to the study and classification of the various kinds of virtues. These must be satisfied with the general term *bugin*, i.e., *good*. *Bugi* means primarily *to be in good health* as well as *to cure*. I have heard the terms *sotō* and *pokto* used as qualificatives of praise. *Sotō horo* means a man on whose word one can rely to a great extent. *Pokto horo* is a morally ambiguous praise: it means a man of resource to carry out any work, whether it be a piece of consummate rascality or of moral merit. These seem to be the Mundarized Hindi words *sut* and *puckka*.

(2) All intellectual accomplishments are summed up in the single word *seranan*. *Seran* means primarily to come to the age of reason. It is also used to denote *wisdom, cleverness*.

(3) What seems more surprising still is the fact that they have only three *generic* terms for colours. The pure blue sky of Chota Nagpur, the light green rice-fields, the forests with their numberless hues as well as everything else that is not white or red are all simply called *hende*, i.e., *black*. From light grey to the purest white everything is *pundi*, *white*. Whatever colour does not fall under these two denominations is *arā*, i.e., *red*. And yet the Mundas are by no means

colour-blind, nor are they indifferent to colours. They delight in them, A profusion of bright colours is especially relished. They denote it by a jingle, "*chiribiri-chiribiri*." If they are urged to specify some kind of red, they will tell you that it is *red like saffron* or *red like this or that flower*. To specify some kind of their wide range of blackness, they will say that something is *black like the rice-fields*, or *like the leaves of this or that tree*, or *like the sky*, or *like the night*. Though they are probably the darkest race in India, they distinguish between the *esal* or *fair*, and the *hende* or *black* individuals of their kinsfolk. For the newcomer from Europe it takes some time before he perceives the difference. They have also a certain number of words entirely restricted to denoting the colours of domestic animals and fowls. The coat of the man-eating Bengal tiger has vividly struck their imagination. Hence they denote his colour by a jingle, *bangad'-bungud' bangad'-bungud'*. The leopard, owing to his greater daring in cattle-stealing, is as much an object of terror as the tiger. His coat is honoured too with a special jingle, "*bangra-bungru bangra-bungru*."

As against their three generic terms for colour, they have at least six or seven to denote qualities affecting the sense of taste.

The Munda's arithmetical notions are, of course, very simple. He has as many Cardinal numbers as he has fingers on both hands, or toes on both feet, viz., *ten* distinct forms. And as though he had summed up fingers and toes into one grand total, he has adopted a special word for twenty, viz., *hisi*. Generally he will place the word *mid'* or *mod'* before *hisi*, and say *mod' hisi*, one twenty, just as we say *one hundred*, *one thousand*. Eleven becomes *gelmid'*, i.e., ten-one; thirty is *mod' hisi gelea*, one-twenty-ten; forty is *bar hisi* or two twenties. Thus he runs up to five and sometimes to six twenties. A special word for *a hundred* or anything beyond it does not exist in Mundari. That number appears to have exceeded their imagination as much as it exceeds the modest sums changing hands in their commercial transactions.

Of Ordinal Numbers they have but two, viz., *sida*, the first, and *etá*, the other.

Distributive Numerals they form by reduplicating the first syllable of the Cardinal numbers. V.gr., *baria*, two; *babaria*, two by two.

Proportional Numerals are formed by means of a suffix literally meaning *towards*. V.gr., *bar-sá*: twice.

The English rule is gradually bringing home to the Munda the necessity of counting further than five or six twenties. But instead

of perfecting his own system, he finds it more convenient to adopt the Hindi one. Now-a-days the Mundari Numerals are hardly used except in out-of-the-way places, where the Hindu money-lender and zamindar have not yet found it profitable enough to establish themselves.

The whole geometrical terminology is limited to the word *gota* : *to be round, to round off*. But this word means also and primarily *whole, entire*. Even Hindi equivalents for such terms as *triangular, square, etc.*, have not yet found their way into the Mundari vocabulary.

A race whose aims and ambitions do not rise beyond the most rudimentary civilisation is not likely to indulge much in those abstract forms of thought which divide being into substance and accidents or compare and classify qualities. As for those still higher and subtler abstractions which are indulged in chiefly for the intense satisfaction they afford to an active mind, they are sure to find no favour with a race for whom thought is synonymous with gloom and recollection or remembrance with sorrow. Hence we need not look for abstract words of a higher kind in Mundari. A kind of abstract nouns of a low type is formed by the insertion of *n* after the first vowel of certain words. That vowel is repeated after the *n*. Thus *argu* means *to lower, to let down*; *anargu* means *a slope*; *bolo* : *to enter*; *bonolo* : *entrance*.

On the other hand, there exist sets of totally *distinct* roots for objects of the same class as well as for states or for forms of activity of the same kind, where we would expect one *generic* term to be specified according to need by various qualitatives. Thus, *v.gr.*, five different words denote the various sitting postures to which the Mundas are accustomed. There are as many as ten different words to designate baskets of different sizes and varying but slightly in form. But this very profusion points to the same fact as the above-mentioned scarcity of words of another kind, *viz.*, the comparative absence of those higher forms of thought which tend to generalize and classify. With regard, then, to words indicative of civilisation and intellectual activity, Mundari may deservedly be called a poor language.

The manner in which the Munda handles his scanty materials appears to point equally to an inability to grapple successfully with

the higher forms of abstract thought. So far, however, as it goes, it is certainly a remarkable product of the spontaneous working of human reason. It differs so totally from anything we are accustomed to in Organic languages that a somewhat lengthy exposition seems necessary to place it in its proper light. This exposition comprises three distinct considerations, viz., (i) *the nature of Mundari words as such*. Here we consider the words simply as signifying units, leaving aside the connotation of all those interrelations which arise solely from the exigencies of the proposition. (ii) *The manner in which words are treated when they do enter as parts into a proposition*, or the manner in which the Kholarian mind conceives the relations existing between the different parts of the proposition. (iii) *The structure or form of the Mundari proposition*.

FUNCTIONS OR SIGNIFYING POWER OF MUNDARI WORDS.

(1) With regard to their signifying power, roots have been divided into two categories: *Predicative roots* and *Demonstrative roots*.

Predicative roots are those which primarily denote living beings, inanimate objects, qualities, states, or actions.

Demonstrative roots are those whose primary office it is either (1) to point out distinctions between living beings or inanimate objects (*e.gr.*, Pronouns), or (2) to signify relations of space and time as well as other relations (*e.gr.*, Prepositions or Postpositions). This division applies, of course, to Mundari roots as well as to those of any other language.

In Organic languages words, as already stated, are no longer bare roots. Organic words are divided into *Parts of Speech*, viz., Nouns, Verbs, Adjectives, Pronouns, Numerals, Adverbs, Conjunctions, and Interjections. Each Part of Speech has its own separate function. Thus *Concrete Nouns* denote either living beings or inanimate objects. *Abstract Nouns* denote qualities, states or actions considered abstractly. *Adjectives* denote qualities concretely only, *i.e.*, as inherent in some subject, whereas *Verbs* denote states or actions concretely, *i.e.*, transitively or intransitively, viz., as referred to some subject or agent in a given proposition; and so on for the other Parts of Speech. These Parts of Speech remain permanently restricted each to its own particular function. The Noun cannot perform the function of a Verb; the Adjective always remains an Adjective; the Adverb remains an Adverb.

Furthermore, these various Parts of Speech are even in the living Organic languages frequently distinguished from each other by their outward form. The extent to which the *functions* of Organic words are thus recognizable from the *word-form* depends on the greater or lesser extent to which the laws of phonetic decay have been at work in a given language; for the outward sign of the function now performed by a Part of Speech was originally some permanent prefix, suffix or infix with a form and a meaning of its own. Hence, in the more ancient languages we meet with a greater number of these characteristic desinences, whereas English has hardly any of them left.

Now, what is the purport of these Parts of Speech? How far and how closely do they follow thought itself, *i.e.*, how far and in what sense do they signify *concepts*? In a word, *what is their real and full power as signifying agents*? Though the answer to this question be implied in the above description, it may be useful to give it more explicitly here, in order to bring out fully the contrast between the signifying power of Organic Parts of Speech and that of Mundari words. If that contrast is well understood, it will be seen that precisely that which we are accustomed to consider as the better part of the value and power of our own words, is by no means essential to *words as such*, and is actually wanting in *Mundari words*.

Bare roots denote living beings, objects, qualities, actions, states, and relations. *Parts of Speech* have the very same *denotative power*. They too denote living beings, objects, etc. But they are not restricted to this *modicum*: they superadd something to it. They *connote* at the same time the *varying* manner in which the mind *may* and *does* *conceive* at different times the living beings, objects, qualities, states, actions, and relations thus *denoted*. They are therefore not, like bare roots, *merely* spoken or written signs of things, actions, etc., but they are also signs of *various forms of abstract thought*. Let us, by way of illustrating this, consider the words *to divide*, *division*, *divisible*, *divisibility*. These are all easily recognized as resulting from the combination of the same primary root with various secondary ones. All four of them denote *one and the same action*. But they do not at all denote that action in *one and the same manner*. The intellect may conceive an action—

(1) *As a physical reality*, *viz.*, as an actual modification of some agent. The concept thus obtained represents the action as referred

to a real subject or agent. Now, the *Verb* "to divide" denotes the action precisely as conceived by the mind in that particular manner which has just been described. The *Organic Verb* therefore does not merely denote actions in a loose, vague manner, *independently* of the various ways in which the mind may conceive them. But it directly *denotes* the actions, and at the same time it *connotes* one and *only one* of the ways in which they may be conceived by the mind. It is therefore something more than the spoken or written sign of an action: it is also the sign of *one particular, well-defined degree of abstract thought*.

(2) The intellect may conceive the same action *independently* of its relation to an agent. It may tear it away from all real relations, and thus transform it into a purely ideal entity—one which, as now conceived, can have no existence out of the thinking mind; for an action without an agent is a physical impossibility. Now the *Abstract Noun* "division" is precisely the spoken or written sign of the concept thus formed. It *directly denotes* the same action which is denoted by the *Verb* to divide. But it *connotes* a degree of thought or abstraction *distinct* from and *higher* than the one connoted by the *Verb*.

(3) The intellect may compare the *concept* represented by the *Noun* "division" with the *concept* of some concrete object in order to see whether that object be susceptible or not of the action in question. If it find the object susceptible of that action, it may conceive that object *precisely*, and *only* as susceptible of the action, leaving out of consideration all its other qualities. The *Adjective* "divisible" becomes the written or spoken sign of the concept thus obtained. It implies therefore a degree of abstraction *distinct* from and *higher* still than the one connoted by the *Noun* "division." Here the action is conceived as an actual modification or quality of an object.

(4) Finally, instead of conceiving the action in the way just described, the mind may consider it as apart from every *object* as well as from every *agent*. It thus transforms it into a purely ideal entity for the purpose of considering it *in itself*, and comparing its *essential characteristics* with those of other similarly obtained *concepts*. Thus it may oppose *divisibility* to *simplicity* or the *ideal geometrical point*, etc. This is, again, a much higher degree of abstraction than the one connoted by the *Adjective* "divisible." The *Abstract Noun* "divisibility"

is the spoken or written sign for *this particular concept or degree of abstraction*.

Now, in the outward form of the above four words, there is absolutely nothing more which could intelligibly and explicitly signify the widely different meanings conveyed by those words. The change of *d* into *s*, the endings *ion*, *ible*, *ibility* have no longer a trace of signifying power if taken by themselves. They are the meaningless remnants of former complete secondary roots added to the primary for the purpose of obtaining an adequate expression of the *four concepts* just described. Though we be no longer conscious of the *manner* in which these meanings were originally obtained, the Aryan mind instinctively grasps those meanings. *The functions* of the elements composing the words remain in our *explicit* consciousness, though *the elements themselves* have to a great extent dropped out of *that explicit consciousness*. *The Parts of Speech* therefore are a kind of crystals which offer to the mind *ready-made spoken or written signs* for every kind and degree of abstract thought the mind is capable of. It is not difficult to see how the formation and existence of such words enriches and strengthens a language. It endows it with an almost indefinite power to express in a comparatively simple manner the highest abstractions of the mind, and gives it a pliability which can follow thought into its most intricate varieties and its finest shades. Deprive words of this character and immediately the expression of even simple forms of thought becomes heavy and obscure. The words by themselves alone no longer convey the full meaning of the speaker's mind: hence the context of the proposition and the circumstances under which it is uttered must, as far as they can, make up for the deficiency in the words' signifying power. Often this will not suffice. Circumlocution must be used where otherwise a single word would do. It may even perhaps be said that no amount of circumlocution can bring home certain abstractions to a race so long as that race has not gone through the hard intellectual effort of making its own language a fit vehicle for those abstractions. Thus, *v. gr.*, the single term *divisibility* is by itself alone equivalent to some such propositions as the following: *We conceive quantity as susceptible of being decomposed either really or ideally into an indefinite number of parts.* The Adjective *divisible* is equivalent to the sentence—*This or that "quantum" (real or ideal) is susceptible of being decomposed into so or so many equal parts.* Hence in the proposition—*twelve is divisible by four,*

the Adjective equals the following circumlocution : the number *twelve* can be decomposed into four parts, each of which contains the same number of units. Our Parts of Speech save us the trouble of composing each time such explicit verbal expressions for these abstractions. In this way they powerfully assist the habit of abstract thought, and confer on the mind an ever-increasing facility to move with both greater ease and rapidity in the higher regions of intellectuality. The evolution of roots into Parts of Speech is therefore an intellectual acquisition of immense value. That mental energy and activity have a great deal to do with that evolution need hardly be stated.

In Mundari this evolution can scarcely be said to have seriously begun. Here we look in vain for four perfect equivalents of the words *to divide*, *division*, *divisible*, and *divisibility*. The word *hating* means indeed *to divide*, but it is not, like the English Verb, restricted to this function, and consequently does not, by itself alone, connote the manner in which the mind conceives the action ; for the very same word denotes also *a part*. Again, the same word signifies *the act of division*. In this signification it has a substantive function. But it has not the *abstract connotative power* of the English Noun *division*. It is a functional equivalent to the English Infinitive in such phrases as *to divide this is easy*. The insertion of *n* after the first vowel yields a real *Abstract Noun*, viz., *hanating*, *the division*, *the partition*. But, as a matter of fact, the Mundas use this Noun to denote both *the action* and its *result*. Thus *hanating* means also *a part*. Primarily, however, it signifies *the action itself*, and it does signify it with a certain emphasis. This particular formation is in reality a decided step towards a higher evolution, and if the Mundas were given a little more to abstract thought, forms of this kind would undoubtedly soon be used exclusively as perfect equivalents of our Abstract Nouns. The Adjective *divisible* can only be rendered by the phrase *hating dariôa* : *it can be divided*, or by the circumlocution, *hatingô-lekaged* : *it is like being divided* (*hatingô* is the Passive of *hating*, and therefore means *to be divided*, whereas *lekaged* means *it is like*). For the Noun *divisibility* the Munda has not only no single word, but he would be sadly at a loss if he had to render the term in any intelligible way at all. Anything like a concise translation of the arithmetical chapter on division is, up to date, an impossibility in Mundari. Instead, then, of Parts of Speech with well-defined functions and a precise but rich denotative and connotative power, we meet in Mundari with words of great functional elasticity,

and therefore of a vague signifying power—words which, whilst *denoting* living beings, actions, qualities, and relations, do generally not by themselves *connote* the *manner* in which the mind conceives the things signified. That *connotation* is generally left to the context of the proposition or the circumstances under which it is uttered; for (1) every Mundari root, whether predicative or demonstrative, may perform at least two functions, viz., (a) its own primary function; (b) the function of a Transitive or an Intransitive Verb. (2) A number of words are susceptible of quite a variety of functions. By way of illustration let us take the word *oró*. It is the ordinary equivalent of the English Conjunction *and*. It may therefore be called a *Conjunction*. However, it is just as much a *Quantitative Adjective* meaning *more*, v. gr., *oró horoko* : *more men*. But instead of being thus used adjectively in connection with a Noun, it may stand by itself alone, and thus perform the function of an *Indefinite Quantitative Pronoun*, v. gr., *Oró omaingme* : *give me more of it*. The same unchanged form may be used as an *Adverb* and thus mean : *again, once more*. Finally, it may assume the functions of either a *Transitive* or an *Intransitive Verb*. Thus used *oró* may mean—(1) *To do more, to say more, to ask for more, to give more*. (Here it is the Adjective *oró* which is used as a Verb.) (2) *To do something again, to ask for something again, to say something again*. (Here it is the Adverb *oró* which is used as a Verb.) This Verb *oró* may in its turn be used as a *Noun*.

Thus the same unchanged form is at the same time a *Conjunction*, an *Adjective*, a *Pronoun*, an *Adverb*, a *Verb*, and a *Noun*, or, to speak more precisely, it may become a *Conjunction*, an *Adjective*, etc., etc.; but by itself alone it is *none of them*. It is simply a vague elastic word, capable of signifying, in a vague manner, several distinct concepts, i.e., of assuming a variety of functions. It does assume this or that function only when it enters actually as part and parcel into a proposition. The function it performs in such a proposition is generally gathered either from the context, or from the position it occupies, or from some Suffix assumed temporarily for a particular purpose. I say *assumed temporarily*, because the original form *oró*, through all its possible functions, is not only incapable of any internal changes, but it repudiates every *permanent Suffix*. In this respect therefore Mundari differs not only from Organic languages, but also from those Agglutinative languages which have evolved Parts of Speech and distinguish Substantives, Verbs, etc., by characteristic and permanent suffixes, prefixes, or by reduplication.

The following series of propositions shows the word *oró* in its various functions:—

- | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| (1) <i>Conjunction.</i> — | Horoko <i>oró</i> Dikuko menákoa,— | Here are Mundas and Hindus. |
| (2) <i>Adjective.</i> — | <i>Oró</i> Dikuko hijútanako,— | More Hindus are coming. |
| (3) <i>Pronoun.</i> — | <i>Oró</i> mená,— | There is more of it. |
| | <i>Pronoun.</i> — <i>Oró-ko</i> hijútanako,— | More of them are coming. |
| (4) <i>Adverb.</i> — | <i>Oró-ko</i> hijútana,— | They are coming again. |
| (5) <i>Verb.</i> — | <i>Oró-a-ko</i> ,— | They will do or say it again. |
| | <i>Oró-a-ko</i> ,— | They will ask or give or say more. |
| (6) <i>Noun.</i> — | <i>Oró</i> ena rabala,— | To do it again is easy, or to ask for more is easy. |

N.B.—The *ko* suffixed to the Pronoun in (3) stands as Plural suffix, whereas the same suffix in (4) stands as Pronominal subject to the Predicate *hijútana*

(II) What has just been said of the vagueness and functional elasticity of *simple words* devoid as yet of any specifying prefixes, infixes or suffixes applies equally to *Mundari compound words*.^{*} This term is not here restricted to those words which we generally call compound words, such as *corn-flour* *dark-blue*, *interfere*, but it includes all those varying forms of *simple words* which arise directly out of the exigencies of the proposition, such as case-forms of Nouns, tense-forms of Verbs, etc., *e.gr.*, *father's*, *came*, *wrote*. For all these are in *Mundari* easily recognised as compounds, in which the primary roots stand out clear and distinct from the secondary roots or the so-called *formative elements*. It is precisely in this class of compounds that the functional difference between *Organic* and *Mundari* words shows itself most strikingly.

In *Organic* languages the case-endings of a Noun or Pronoun, the desinences or auxiliaries indicating Voice, Mood, and Tense of a Verb, the personal pronominal desinences of Verbs, and the endings indicating degrees of comparison in Adjectives or Adverbs do add something to the signification of Nouns, Pronouns, Verbs, and Adjectives, but they do not change the nature of their signifying power. The Noun still remains a Noun, the Adjective remains Adjective, and the Verb still performs the function of a Verb. This kind of desinences or formative elements simply point out the particular relation in which the words specified by them stand to some other words of the same proposition.

^{*} In considering the functional elasticity of *Mundari* compounds, we abstract entirely from the manner in which they are obtained. That indeed is a consideration quite apart. Here we simply take them as we find them ready-made, and contrast their functional character with that of their *Organic* equivalents.

In the proposition *Thy brother's horse runs faster than mine*, the word *brother's* is the spoken sign of the same kind of being and of the same concept of which the word *brother* is a sign. But the desinence 's' exhibits that being as standing in the relation of owner to a being denoted by the word *horse*. *Runs* denotes the same concrete action which is denoted by *run*, but the *s* refers the action to a particular subject, viz., *horse*. *Faster* signifies the same generic modification of an action which is denoted by *fast*. But the ending *er* exhibits it as exceeding in intensity the speed of the second horse spoken of in the same sentence. We cannot *conjugate* Organic Nouns, Adjectives or Conjunctions, nor can we *decline* the Tense-forms of Organic Verbs, nor can we add *desinences* indicative of *degrees of comparison* to any Part of Speech except Adjectives and Adverbs. And the reason of this lies precisely in the fact that this kind of *secondary elements* is exclusively destined to point out the *intra-propositional relations* of words which are already perfect as Parts of Speech.

A consequence of this is another fact which we must attend to when we compare the *functional character* of these Organic forms with their Mundari equivalents. It is this. The Organic forms under consideration, if taken by themselves alone, do not satisfy the mind, because their special formative elements raise questions which can only be answered by the context of a proposition. Thus, the form *would come* makes us ask instinctively: who? and under what circumstances or conditions would he or they come? In this sense therefore we may say that these forms have no existence independently of a proposition. Nevertheless, if we do detach them from their context, they still *are always capable of suggesting to the mind a complete and well-defined concept*. Thus, *v. gr.*, the forms *brother's* and *would come* at once call up in the mind the very same concepts which are signified by the Nominative *brother* and the Infinitive *to come*; although the case-ending 's' and the auxiliary *would* cause the mind to ask for a context in order to bring out fully the meaning suggested by these formative elements.

Mundari can produce compounds denoting the very same relations which are denoted by Organic *Cases* or *Tenses*. It has even a greater number of Tense-suffixes than any Organic language can show. The compounds thus obtained resemble their Organic equivalents in this that they can have no existence independently of a proposition, but they differ from them in this that *very often* they cannot even incipiently suggest to the mind any definite concept at all if torn away

from every context. In order to know what such a compound may mean, it is necessary that we should know (1) what function its primary root performs in a given proposition; (2) what functions its secondary root or roots perform in the same proposition. But frequently all this can only be gathered from the circumstances under which that proposition is uttered. Hence (3) it is often necessary that we should know those circumstances. When therefore the Munda has formed a compound by infixing or suffixing to *the primary root* such *secondary ones* as denote Case, Voice, Mood or Tense, he does not yet obtain a *Part of Speech* or a sign exclusively representing one sharply-defined concept. All he obtains is a *compound word* which, within the logical limits of the new specifications caused by these secondary roots, is as little restricted to one single function as any *simple* predicative or demonstrative root. Such a compound may, without undergoing a further change of form, assume all those functions which are still in any way compatible with the limitations or specifications denoted by its secondary roots. Hence we meet with material *Case-forms* assuming the functions of an Organic Verb, and with *Tense-forms* taking the Case-suffixes of Nouns; *v. gr.*, *reá* is one of the five Mundari Genitive suffixes; *orá* means *house*. The compound *orá-reá* therefore means *of the house*. But it may just as well be an Intransitive form, and thus mean *it is in the house* or *they* (*viz.*, inanimate objects) *are in the house*. Unless, therefore, we know the circumstances under which this compound is uttered, it is impossible to know what function it actually performs. Nor can the word by itself alone call up any definite concept in the mind, precisely because under one set of circumstances it may directly denote an object, *viz.*, *house*, whereas under different circumstances it may denote a *state*, *viz.*, the state of some thing being then and there in a house.

As a further illustration of the functional elasticity of Mundari compounds, take the various meanings of *oró-ko* in the following propositions:—

- (1) Nereko kamikeda *oróko* senójana,—They worked here *and then they* went away.
- (2) Hijúdoko hijúlana mendo *oróko* senójana,—They really did come, but *they* went away *again*.
- (3) Hanre ka beseá enreo *oróko* senójanako,—It is not good over there; nevertheless—*more of them* have gone (thither).
- (4) *Oróko* sajaikom—Punish those who will do it *again*.

In (1) and (2) the suffix *ko* is the Personal Pronoun standing as Subject to the Predicates *senójana*. It is therefore impossible to ascertain the function of the compound *oróko* from this suffix. Can it be ascertained from the primary root *oró*? No, for there is nothing in the form of either proposition which allows us to conclude anything with certainty regarding the function of *oro'*. It may be the Conjunction *and* or the Adverb *again* in either of the two propositions. Hence the circumstances must decide whether here the primary root performs the function of a Conjunction or that of an Adverb.

In (3) and (4) *ko* performs the function of a Plural suffix. In (3) it is the Plural suffix to *oro'* used as an Indefinite Pronoun. This can be made out from the existence of a distinct Pronominal subject *ko* suffixed to *senójana*. In (4) *ko* acts as Plural suffix to the Future Tense used as a Participial Noun of Agency. That here *oróko* is a Noun of Agency will at once be felt instinctively by the Munda. But that little sentence, *Oróko sajaikom*, would puzzle many a foreigner, though he may have spoken *his own Mundari* perhaps already for years.

Tense-forms are best suited to illustrate the functional elasticity of Mundari compounds in a striking manner.

The Mundari equivalent of an Organic Transitive Verb has *four Voices, five Moods, and twenty-one Tenses*. Each Tense has *three Numbers*—Singular, Dual, and Plural, with altogether *eleven Personal forms and one Impersonal form*. All this array of Voices, Moods, and Tenses can be tabulated into a scheme of great regularity, apparently resembling a scheme of Organic Conjugations very much indeed. It is then not astonishing that beginners should look on these as exclusively equivalent to Organic Verb-forms, and therefore as restricted to the functions of Transitive Predicates. But that is a fatal mistake; for Mundari has not only *no Conjugation* in our sense of the word, but it has not even any *Verbs* at all, as we shall see by and bye. The twenty-one Mundari Tense-forms may indeed be *Transitive Predicates*, but they are just as well *Adjectives, Adverbs* or *Concrete* or *Abstract Nouns*. Frequently they are equivalent to *whole Relative Clauses* or to *Circumstantial Clauses of Place, Time* or *Manner*.

The root or word *om* denotes *the act of giving* substantively as well as transitively. It means therefore also to *give*. The Tense-suffix of the simple Past in the Active Voice is *ked*. Hence *omked* is the Simple Past Tense. I call it *bare Tense-form* because it contains only the primary root *plus* that element which connotes time. In this respect,

then, it is equivalent to the Latin *ded* or the Greek $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa$ ($\epsilon\delta\omega$) and the English *gave*.

This bare Tense-form may, like its Latin and Greek equivalents, stand as Predicate, *i.e.*, it may be referred to a Subject. This act of reference is in Latin and Greek effected by the mere fact of the Personal desinences being added to the bare Tense-form or theme. *Ded-i* or $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa-\alpha$ means *I gave*. In Mundari the reference of the Transitive or Intransitive Predicate to a Subject is made by means of the Copula *á* or *a*; *ing* means *I*. Hence *omked-a-ing* = *dedi*, $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$, or, *I gave*. Here is the complete scheme of the Simple Past Tense:—

Predicate.	Copula.	Subject.	Pred.	Subj.	Subject.	Predicate.
Omked	— a —	ing	= $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa-\alpha$,	I		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	m	= $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa-\alpha\varsigma$,	thou		<i>gavest</i> .
Omked	— a —	e	} = $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa-\epsilon$,	he or she		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— á —			it		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	lang,		thou and I		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	ling,		he or she and I		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	ben,		you two		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	king,		these or those two		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	bu	} = $\epsilon\delta\omega-\mu\epsilon\nu$,	you and we	{	<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	le		they and we		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	pe	$\epsilon\delta\omega-\tau\epsilon$,	you		<i>gave</i> .
Omked	— a —	ko	$\epsilon\delta\omega-\kappa\alpha\nu$,	they		<i>gave</i> .

Neither the Copula *á* nor the Personal Pronouns figuring as Subjects in the above Mundari scheme are mere desinences in the sense in which the corresponding Greek Personal Subjects are desinences exclusively belonging to a Transitive Predicate.

For (1) the Mundari Subjects are the current Personal Pronouns of the language, whereas the Greek Subjects are so no longer.

(2) The Greek Subjects must be *suffixed* to the bare Tense-form or theme, whereas the Mundari Subjects are not restricted to that position. In fact, whenever a word precedes the Predicate, those Subjects are detached from the Predicate and suffixed to that word, so as to form the last syllable of it, so far as pronunciation is concerned. Thus in the propositions : *I, thou, he, etc., gave yesterday*, we get in Mundari the following : *Hola-ing omkeda, hola-m omkeda, hola-e omkeda, etc.*

As for the *a* in conjunction with a *bare Tense-form*, it is not restricted to the function of a Copula or link-word between a Predicate and a

Subject. It can act equally as formative element of a Noun. Thus the form *omkedā* by itself alone means *that which some one has given*. This derivative from an Active Tense has no single-worded equivalent in any Organic language. The closest literal translation—"the somebody having given thing"—sounds barbarous. Yet it is the manner in which this particular signification is conceived by the Munda mind.

In comparing Organic with Mundari Tense-forms, we must attend to the following points:—

- (1) *Bare* Organic Tense-forms, such as *ded*, ἔδωκ, are incomplete and meaningless if separated from the Personal desinences; *ded* and ἔδωκ mean nothing: they are not *words*; whereas *dedi* and ἔδωκα are words and mean *I gave*.
- (2) The *mechanism* of Organic languages (if I may so call the particular lines along which the Aryan languages have developed) precludes them from using their bare Tense-forms either adjectively or substantively. If they want to use a Tense-form either substantively or adjectively, they must have recourse to Infinitive or Participial desinences. These special desinences *may* affect the theme or primary element *in its form*. Thus δοῦς and δοῦναι are the Participle and Infinitive of ἔδωκα, *I gave*.
- (3) That same mechanism tends to limit the power of even this process more and more. Thus Latin has already fewer Infinitives and Participles than Greek, and modern languages have fewer than Latin.

In Mundari the case is very different:—

- (1) The bare Tense-form *omked* is a complete word by itself alone. It has not only one, but several meanings. That is why we must see it in a context in order to know which of its possible functions it actually performs.
- (2) This complete word may, without the aid of any special suffix, be used either substantively or adjectively. *Omked* is equivalent to δοῦναι, *dedisse*, *to have given*, as well as to δοῦς, *having given*.
- (3) Every one of the 21 Mundari *bare Tense-forms* may thus be used either substantively or adjectively.

In other words, though Mundari has no special Infinitive or Participial forms, it has, *functionally*, as many Infinitives and Participles as it has Tenses in any of its four voices. Of course most of the Tense-forms thus used substantively or adjectively cannot be translated into English, except by Relative Clauses.

When used as Participial Adjectives, they are placed immediately before the Noun they qualify, and they never take any suffixes indicative of either Gender, Number or Case. V.gr., *omked horo*, the man who gave; *omked horoking*, the two men who gave; *omked horoko*, the men who gave.

The dissimilarity between the two processes of treating Tense-forms does not end here. The Organic Infinitive, though it has a substantive function, will not allow itself to be treated in every respect like other Nouns. It refuses the ordinary Case-suffixes, nor can it be governed by Prepositions. *ḍouvai* cannot be declined, nor could we say in Latin: *Gratias refero tibi*, pro-dedissee *librum*,—I thank thee for to have given the book.

The Mundari Tense-form, on the contrary, behaves in every respect both like an ordinary Adjective and like an ordinary Noun. In its substantive function it may take all the suffixes any other word, such as v. gr., *orá*, house, may take. Besides suffixes denoting relations of space, it may take suffixes of time distinct from the Tense-suffixes. In fact, every suffix denoting any function which is at all compatible with the general concept of an action may be added to a bare Mundari Tense-form. A few examples will show this more clearly:—

1st.—We have seen that in its adjective function the Tense-form precedes the Noun. But a Noun can always be replaced by a Personal Pronoun. Hence instead of *Tense* followed by *Noun*, we may have *Tense* followed by *Pronoun*. But since the ordinary Mundari Personal Pronouns are always *suffixes*, this combination of Tense *plus* Pronoun yields one single word.

Omked *horo*,— The man who gave.
Omked *horoking*,—The two men who gave.
Omked *horoko*,— The men who gave.

Omkedí,— The one who gave.
Omked'king,—The two who gave.
Omked'ko,— Those who gave.

2nd.—A Mundari Adjective is turned into an Adverb of Manner by means of the suffixes *leka*, *lekage*, *lekate*, *lekatege*, v. gr., *bugilekate*;

literally, good-like, *i.e.*, properly, in the right way. These same suffixes may be used to transform any Tense-form into an Adverb of Manner. But Adverbs of this class can never be translated by a single word into English. *Atkarjaiña* means *I feel* and *I am under the impression*. Hence *Omked'-leka at'karjaiña* means *I feel like having given, i.e., I am under the impression that I did give*.

3rd.—*á* means *it*. Hence, *omked'-á* means *that which someone gave*.

4th.—*Rá* is a Genitive Suffix to Nouns. Hence *omked'-rá rasika*,—The joy one experiences for having given (*literally*, the joy of having given).

5th.—*Te* denotes cause. Hence *omked'-te-ko sukujana*,—They are happy *because* they gave (*literally*, they rejoice on account of having given).

6th.—*Re* means *in*, and is also used to denote condition. Hence *omked'-re-ko sukujana honang*; *literally*, in the having given they would have rejoiced, *i.e.*, they would be happy now if they had given.

7th.—*Täre* means *there* and *there where*. Hence *omked'-täre-ko lelkiá*,—They saw him at the very place where he gave.

8th.—*Intage* means “at the very moment.” Hence *omked'-intage lelkiáko*,—They saw him at the very moment when he gave.

Tense-forms used substantively never become perfect functional equivalents of our Abstract Nouns, which connote that the action is there and then conceived as abstracted from all real relations; for they still signify the actions as *referred to an agent* and as *having a real terminus or object*. This is clearly proved by the following fact:—The Munda inserts Direct and Indirect Pronominal Objects into his Transitive Predicates. In the Definite Present and the Definite Imperfect, these Objects must stand between the primary root and the Tense-suffix. Example—*Dal* means *to strike*; the Definite Present suffix is *tan*; the Definite Imperfect suffix is *tan + taiken*; *ko* means *they* and *them*.

Hence, he is striking them now,

{	Root.	Dir. obj.	T. suff.	Cop.	Subj
{	Dal	- ko	- tan	- a	- e.

In the Imperfect Tenses the Subject generally stands between *tan* and *taiken*.

Hence, he was striking them then, {^{Root. Dir. obj. Tense. Subj. Tense. Copula.}
Dal - ko - tan - e - taeken - a.

This is of course pronounced like one word—dalkotanetaikena.

In all the other Tenses Direct and Indirect Objects stand between the Tense-suffix and the Copula. Hence—

Simple Past.—He struck them: Dalked'-ko-a-e.

Anterior Past.—He struck them first: Dalled'-ko-a-e.

Whenever the Direct or Indirect Object to a Transitive Predicate is a living being, Pronominal Objects *must be* inserted into the Predicate according to the above rules. When no Pronominal Object is inserted, it is understood *ipso facto* that the Direct Object is an inanimate being.

Now, whenever a Transitive Predicate is detached from its Copula and Subject in order to be used adjectively or substantively, it is detached together with its Pronominal Objects—

Dal-ko-tan ho-ro,—The man who strikes *them* now.

Dal-ko-tan-i,—The one who strikes *them* now; *Dal-ko-tan-king*,—The two who strike *them* now; *Dal-ko-tan-ko*,—Those who strike *them* now.

Dalked'-ko-ni,—The one who struck *them*; *Dalled'-ko-king*,—The two who struck *them* first.

Dalled'-ko-reá sajai,—The punishment incurred for having struck *them* first (*literally*, the punishment of the act of striking *them* first).

Dalled'-ko-táre-king lekia,—Both saw him there where he struck *them* first.

The suffix of the Possessive Genitives is *á*. Hence *Dalled'-ko-niá orá* means "The house of the one who struck *them* first."

To denote presence in a certain place or near a person or object, it suffices to suffix *re*, *in*, or *táre*, *near* to the word denoting the place or person or object, add the Subject to these suffixes, and then add the Copula *a*. This transforms the word into an Intransitive Predicate.

Noun. Suffix. Subj. Cop.

Hence, *Dalled'-ko-niá-orá - re - ko - á*,—They are in the house of the one who struck *them* first.

Dalled'-ko-ni-táre-ko-á,—They are near the one who struck *them* first. Here, then, we have an example of a Tense-form being used

substantively, and then being retransformed into an Intransitive Predicate denoting presence near a person, but still retaining its original Transitive function. The compound *orärekoá* exhibits the Locative Case of a simple Noun, transformed into a similar Intransitive Predicate.

As a further illustration of the utter functional instability of both simple and compound Mundari words, I shall add the following examples:—*Martobe* is an Interjection meaning *all right! let us begin!* *Martobe-pe-a* means: *now, then, say martobe, i.e., begin the work like fellows who say martobe!* (Here the Interjection is used as an Imperative with the *Familiar Interjection a* suffixed.)

Boys having learned to begin a race after counting in Hindi up to three—*ek, do, tin!* by way of signal, will transform these Numerals into a so-called Verb in order to say—*Let us begin after counting one, two, three—ekdotin-e-a-bu.* *Bu* is the Subject, *a* the Copula, the *e* is euphonic. *Literally, this means we shall ekdotin it, i.e., we shall start after the signal ek, do, tin!*

Sim means a fowl. *Simked'-ko-a-le*—literally, *we fowled them.* This generally means *we have acquired (them) the fowls.* But it may also mean *we have killed fowls to eat them, i.e. (to-day), we have fowl for our dinner.*

Mahara means a cowherd; *akad* is the Suffix of the Perfect Tense. Hence, *Maharaakad'koale*,—*We have cowherded them, i.e., our cattle; we have entrusted our cattle to a cowherd.* But it may also mean *We have engaged them (these men) as cowherds.* Of course this Tense-form may go again through the modifications indicated above. Thus, *Maharaakad'konti*,—*The one who has his cattle grazed by a cowherd.*

It may be said that this method of treating words is very handy and expeditious. No doubt it is so in a certain way. But it would have to be abandoned were the Mundas to take to literature; for the above examples suffice to show how absolutely necessary it is for the listener to know the circumstances under which such compounds are uttered. As clear and self-sufficient *signifying agents*, these compounds are practically useless. They are too narrow, too material, too dependent on trivial circumstances to be of use in literature; they can only do real service in a very familiar conversation about narrow domestic or village matters, where all the circumstances are supposed to be known to the listener.

Still proceeding on this fundamental principle of his language, the Munda retransforms *whole propositions* into *compound words*, and uses them as Predicates in other propositions. Take the following proposition: *Hoka-a-lang*, Thou and I shall stop or cease. Here *hoka* is Predicate, *a* is Copula, *lang* is Subject. The addition of a new Pronominal Subject and Copula transforms this proposition into a mere compound Predicate, thus—

Dir. object.	Subj.	Predicate.	Copula.
<i>Neado</i>	- <i>le</i>	<i>hōkaalang</i>	- <i>á.</i>

Literally, this we *hokaalang* it, i.e., this we express by saying (*hokaalang*) thou and I shall stop. *Nájom*, a sorcerer. *Nájomkoako*, they treat them as sorcerers:—

Dir. obj.	Subj.	Predicate.	Copula.
<i>Neado</i>	- <i>le</i>	<i>nájomkoako</i>	- <i>á.</i>

This (process) we express by saying "they treat them as sorcerers."

Sarti means *true*; *sarti-á* means *it is true*. Hence, *sartiákedako* means "they believed it"—*literally*, they *it is trued it*, i.e., they said to themselves *it is true*.

It is easy to see how deeply the functional elasticity of Mundari roots and compounds affects the grammar of the language. Not only does it give to its etymological part a character widely different from the etymology of an Organic language, but it does away altogether with a great part of Organic syntax; for by substituting compound words for every kind of Organic Subordinate Clauses, it eliminates with one stroke the complicated laws which regulated the Moods and the so-called sequence of Tenses in the Subordinate Clauses.

THE MUNDARI PROPOSITION OR SENTENCE.

Isolated words, whether simple or compound, bare roots or organic forms, are the spoken signs of concepts. But the mind is not satisfied with isolated concepts: it cannot rest until it has wrought at least two such concepts into an *intellectual totum*, which might be called a *mental picture*. When, for instance, we join the concepts denoted by the words *horse* and *run* we obtain such a mind-picture. This is translated into language by the proposition: *the horse runs*. These are of course quite distinct from mere sense-perceptions and the picturings of the imagination.

We may at times seem to be working on a single idea or concept, but in that case we are in reality decomposing a complex idea into its elements for the purpose of selecting some two or three of these elements to rearrange them into a mental picture which will exhibit one particular aspect of the idea we were working on. This process we go through each time we formulate some definition. *V. gr.*, the concept denoted by the term *man* includes in an implicit or embryonic manner all the essential characteristics of man. But it is impossible for the mind to represent to itself at any one instant explicitly and clearly all that is contained implicitly in this complex concept. It can only picture man to itself under one particular aspect at a given moment. It may at one moment represent him as a moral being, at another as an intelligent being, at another, again, as a being composed of both matter and mind. Thus it obtains successively the different mind-pictures which are signified by the propositions: *man is a responsible being; man is an intelligent being; man is a rational animal*. If a speaker only uttered the isolated word *man*, a listener, though understanding the term, would still be at a loss to know what he was driving at. But by uttering one of the above sentences he calls up in the listener's mind a definite mind-picture. The listener then knows that the same picture exists at that moment in the speaker's mind. He understands him. The act of thus uniting two or more concepts into a mind-picture is, in logical terminology, called *a judgment*. Since the mind can think only by judgments, we may call the judgment the working unit of the intellect. Hence concepts are related to the judgment as constitutive elements are related to the whole or *totum*.

Considered as a mental act, the judgment is in reality a perfectly simple act, for it consists essentially in the perception of either agreement or disagreement between two concepts.

Hence, *an affirmative judgment* is that act of the mind by which we refer one concept to another as either necessarily or contingently belonging to it.

A negative judgment is that act of the mind by which we separate one concept from another as disagreeing with it.

When we examine two concepts thus concurring into a judgment, we find that one of them always acts as a kind of substratum, or rather as an element requiring a closer specification or determination—an element about which the mind may be said to ask a question. This concept is called *the Subject*. The second concept contains the particular

specification which is required by the Subject. It answers the question which the mind puts concerning the Subject. This concept is called *the Predicate*, i.e., that which is then and there predicated of the Subject. The Predicate being the determining element may be considered as the more important factor. Thus every judgment consists necessarily of *two* primary or essential elements—a *Subject* and a *Predicate*. The mind may introduce other elements into the judgment, but these do not affect the *constitutive duality* of the judgment; for they are all merely explicitations or extensions or explanations of either the Subject or the Predicate. For instance, Predicates denoting actions generally imply a *terminus*. Thus the idea of seeing implies an object which is seen. This terminus is called the *Direct Object*. Many words denoting actions imply a double terminus, *v. gr.*, the idea of giving implies not only an object which is given, but also a being to whom the object is given. Such a second terminus is called *the Indirect Object*. Both Direct and Indirect Objects are therefore only natural complements or explicitations of the Predicate. They are part of the Predicate, but do not form a new constitutive element of the judgment. The same is true of any additions or explanations which may be added either to the Subject or to the Predicate.

From what has just been said we see that in a judgment concepts are not merely juxtaposed at random. Such a juxtaposition would as little yield a judgment as the random juxtaposition of colours would produce a picture. Even as the painter blends different colours into a material picture, so does the mind, in its judgments, blend various concepts into an intellectual picture. That blending is done by aptly correlating and subordinating them to each other. But this presupposes in the mind an innate power of grasping purely intellectual relations and of instinctively and rapidly classifying the different concepts of a judgment under the various categories of apprehended relations.

It is in this act that the superiority of intellect or reason over mere sense manifests itself so strikingly; and since all languages are a more or less perfect physical imitation of this purely intellectual act, it has been said with truth that language constitutes an insuperable barrier between man and the mere animal world.

The spoken sign of a judgment is the *proposition* or *sentence*, just as words are the spoken signs of *concepts*. Since the proposition is the physical counterpart of the mental judgment, it is evident that it

cannot merely juxtapose at random the words denoting the various concepts which constitute a judgment. It must in some way or another connote at the same time all the relations in which the concepts stand one to another. These relations are a set of purely mental abstractions quite distinct from the abstractions described above (pp. xvii, xviii, xix) as implied in the Organic Parts of Speech. They arise directly out of the exigencies of the judgment as such. Some of them are purely logical and necessary relations, such as, *v. gr.*, those which exist between the Subject and the Predicate; others are external and contingent, such as, for instance, the various relations of space, time or manner.

The means which language has at its disposal are necessarily limited, and may be summed up under three heads—

- (1) A particular and fixed order of words in the proposition.
- (2) Reduplication of the first or last syllable of certain words.
- (3) The use of special words used to directly denote relations of space and time. These are the simple or compound Demonstratives, such as Pronouns, Prepositions or Postpositions of space and time, etc.

The three methods are used simultaneously in all languages; but not to the same extent nor yet in the same manner. Some use the order of words more extensively for the purpose of connoting the grammatical relations, whereas others have recourse more freely to the use of Demonstratives. Again, it happens that two different languages using the order of words to connote one and the same relation do not arrange the correlated words in the same order.

The methods used by the Kholarian dialects differ in most respects widely from those used by the Aryan languages. As a consequence of this divergence the Mundari proposition bears an aspect very different from its Aryan equivalent. It is regulated by laws which find no application in the Aryan proposition. A comparison between the Aryan and Kholarian methods on a few essential points will bear out this statement.

1.—Methods of connoting the relation between the Subject and the Predicate.

This relation is a logical or necessary one; for whatever we predicate in a proposition may roughly be defined as either a state or an action.

But a state necessarily implies some subject, and every action implies an agent. Hence the Subject and the Predicate are each the natural complement of the other, and *as thus implying each other*, they constitute the very essence of the judgment. They are blended into a new mental unit.

The words denoting the two concepts thus blended being physical elements cannot, of course, perfectly imitate this mental process. Nevertheless, since language is the natural outward imitation of thought, we may expect it to instinctively tend towards welding the terms denoting Subject and Predicate into one compound word or at least to juxtapose them immediately. As a matter of fact, however, though juxtaposition be used extensively, it has, so to say, been judged insufficient by a certain number of languages. Organic languages have recourse to it only when the Predicate denotes an action conceived as a reality, *i.e.*, when it is a *Verb*. In that case the Subject is suffixed to the Predicate in the shape of a Personal Pronoun. Predicate and Subject reacting on each other have produced those peculiar compounds which we meet chiefly in the more ancient organic conjugations, where the Pronominal Subject has become a mere desinence and the root of the Predicate itself has sacrificed something of its original form to the welding of Subject and Predicate into a single word. That the position of the Pronoun immediately after the Predicate is really intended to connote the relation between Subject and Predicate is clearly shown by the fact that these Pronominal desinences must remain even in those propositions where the Subject is expressed by a separate Noun or a current Pronoun, *v. gr.*, Rex da-*t*,—The king give-*s*.

The Organic languages went a step further still. To Nouns standing as Subject they also affixed a demonstrative root for the purpose of connoting the relation between such Nouns and the Predicate. Thus they obtained eventually a special *Subject form* of Nouns, *viz.*, the *Nominative Case*, which, like the Verb, consists of the bare Noun + a formative element or desinence. These Nominative desinences are extended to Pronouns and Adjectives. Hence when the Subject of a proposition is a Noun or a Pronoun, and the Predicate is a Verb, then the relation between Subject and Predicate is connoted twice, *viz.*, *first*, by the Pronominal desinence of the Predicate; *secondly*, by the Nominative desinence of the Noun or Pronoun. Thus Duc-*s* (*dux*) veni-*t*.

Whenever the Predicate of a proposition is either a Noun or an Adjective, Organic languages use a link-word or Copula to connect the Predicate with the Subject, *v. gr.*, this man *is* a European. They *are* honest.

Now this Copula behaves like an ordinary Verb Predicate, inasmuch as it takes Pronominal desinences agreeing with the Subject in Number and Person. Hence here the relation of Subject to Predicate is *directly* or *primarily* denoted first by the Copula, second by the Nominative desinence of Nouns or Pronouns, and *indirectly* again by the personal desinence of the Copula as well as by the Nominative desinence of the Noun or Adjective standing as Predicate, *v. gr.*, Rec-*s* nost-*er* es-*t* duc-*s* bon-*us*. Whereas the Copula *est* connects the Predicate *dux bonus* with the Subject *rex noster*, the several Nominative desinences of the Nouns and Adjectives perform the function of exhibiting the concepts denoted as perfectly co-ordinated in one and the same logical relation.

Thus, then, the method used by Aryan languages to connote the relation between Subject and Predicate does, as a matter of fact, divide Organic propositions into two classes, so far as their outward form is concerned—

- (1) Propositions without a formal link-word.
- (2) Propositions with a formal link-word.

The phonetic decay of the personal pronominal desinences has in modern Aryan languages largely increased the number of propositions belonging to the second class. The word used as Copula is generally the so-called Substantive Verb *to be*, and this is treated as an ordinary Verb. Some of its forms are taken from a root meaning *to become*. This copula directly and primarily denotes either *existence* (real or ideal) or *a rising into existence*. Hence the function it performs as link-word is a secondary one superadded to its primary meaning for the particular purpose of referring Predicates to their Subjects.

The Mundari method of connoting the relation between Subject and Predicate differs very radically from the Aryan method—more radically even than it appears at first sight. Mere juxtaposition of the Subject and Predicate is not used. The short questions and replies in which *Substantive Predicates* are occasionally placed immediately after the Subject in affirmative, or before it, in interrogative propositions are in reality merely elliptic propositions. Thus *Munda okoe?*—Who (is) village-chief? *Ni Munda*,—This one (is) village-chief.

(1) Every Mundari Predicate is connected with its Subject by means of a Copula.

(2) The word denoting existence, viz., *mená*, is not used as Copula.

(3) There are in Mundari *two distinct Copulas*, viz., *tan* and *á* or *a*. *Tan* is used as link-word only when the Predicate is a Noun or Pronoun, whereas *a* is used when the Predicate is either an Adjective or a Verb.

(4) Mundari propositions too are therefore divided into two classes, but the division rests on a different principle from the one on which the Aryan classification is based.

(5) Nouns, Pronouns, and Adjectives take no suffix indicative of the relation here under discussion. There is therefore in Mundari *no Subject or Nominative-Case suffix* of Nouns, Pronouns, and Adjectives.

(6) Neither *tan* nor *á* (*a*) ever undergo any change or mutilation of form.

(7) Nevertheless, *tan* and *a* are not the sole exponents of the relation between Subject and Predicate, for *tan* must always take the current Personal Pronoun as *immediate Subjective suffix* even in propositions where the concept standing as Subject is expressed by either a Noun or another Pronoun. Hence it is the Copula *tan* plus the *Pronominal suffix* which connotes the relation.

Subj.	Cop.	Pred.	Pred.	Cop.	Subj.
I	am	a Munda.	Hoꝛo	<i>tan-</i>	<i>ing.</i>
Thou	art	a Munda.	Hoꝛo	<i>tan-</i>	<i>me.</i>
He	is	a Munda.	Hoꝛo	<i>tan-</i>	<i>i.</i>

Subj.	Cop.	Pred.	Subj.	Pred.	Cop.	Subj. Suff.
This servant	is	a Munda.	Ne dasi	Hoꝛo	<i>tan-</i>	<i>i.</i>
These two servants	are	Mundas.	Ne dasiking	Hoꝛoking	<i>tan-</i>	<i>king.</i>
These servants	are	Mundas.	Ne dasiko	Hoꝛoko	<i>tan-</i>	<i>ko.</i>

Similarly, a Subjective Pronominal Suffix must be used together with the Copula *á* (*a*) to connote the relation between Adjective and Transitive or Intransitive Predicates and their Subject. But in this case the construction differs slightly; whereas the Copula *tan* is not a suffix or syllable of the Predicate, the Copula *á* (*a*) is always immediately suffixed to Adjective or Transitive and Intransitive Predicates. The Subjective Pronominal suffix is added to the Copula only when no other word precedes the Predicate. Whenever another word precedes the Predicate, the Pronominal suffix is added to that word, and thus

forms its last syllable. Adjectives standing as Predicates generally take the enclitic *ge, v. gr., bugin*, well (in good health), *buginge*—

	Predic.Cop.Subj.		Predic.Cop.Subj.
I am well,—	Buginge -a -ing.	Thou and I are well,—	Buginge-a-lang.
Thou art well,—	Buginge -a -m.	He and I are well,—	Buginge-a-ling.
He is well,—	Buginge -a -e.	You two are well,—	Buginge-a-ben.

Senken is the Simple Past Tense of *sen*, to go. Hence it means *went*—

Subj. Predic.	Predic.Cop Subj.	Subj.	Pred.	Predic.Cop.Subj.
I went,—	Senken -a -ing.	Thou and I went,—	Senken- a- lang.	
Thou wentst,—	Senken -a -m.	He and I went,—	Senken- a- ling.	
He went,—	Senken -a -e.	You two went,—	Senken- a- ben.	

Subj.	Pred.	Subj. Pred. Cop.
I	went yesterday,—	Hola -ing senken -a.
Thou	wentst yesterday,—	Hola -m senken -a.
He	went yesterday,—	Hola -e senken -a.

Subject.	Pred.	Subj.	Pr. Subj.	Pred. Cop.
The servant	went yesterday,—	Dasi	hola- e	senken -a.
The two servants	went yesterday,—	Dasiking	hola- king	senken -a.
The servants	went yesterday,—	Dasiko	hola- ko	senken -a.

In the Imperfect Tenses the Tense-sign consists of two distinct suffixes, viz., the suffix of a particular Past or Present Tense, *plus* the generic Imperfect suffix *taeken*. Thus, for instance, *sentan* is the Definite Present of *sen*. Hence *sentan taeken* is the Definite Imperfect, meaning *was going along at that moment*. In these Tenses the Pronominal Subject generally stands between the particular Tense-sign and the Imperfect sign *taeken*—

Subj.	Predicate.	Predicate.
		Subj. Cop.
I	was going along,—	Sentan -ing- taeken -a.
Thou	wast going along,—	Sentan -em- taeken -a.
He	was going along,—	Sentan -e- taeken -a.

From these examples we see that the Pronominal Subjects, though not restricted to one fixed position with regard to the Predicate, must, nevertheless, be in *immediate contact* either with the Copula or with the Predicate. No word can ever intervene between these Pronominal

Subjects and the Predicate or between them and the Copula. This particular kind of contact is no doubt intended to assist in its way towards the connotation of the relation between Subject and Predicate.

The division of Organic propositions into two classes, viz., one class without a link-word, and the other with a link-word, is not based directly on the logical nature of the Predicate-concept, but on the etymological form of the word which denotes that concept. This is clear from the fact that whenever an Organic language uses an Adjective, i.e., a Participial form as Predicate in certain Tenses that Predicate must be connected with its Subject by means of a Copula. In the sentence *Rex proficiscitur* there is no Copula, whereas in *Rex profectus est* we meet with a Copula, although the idea denoted by *profectus* is specifically the same as that which is denoted by *proficiscitur*.

It is hardly to our purpose to point out here the logical reason underlying the use of the Participial forms. This much, however, may be said that a great amount of abstract thought is embodied in these as well as in all other Organic word-forms. The Aryan has the advantage of being able to use the abstractions thus stereotyped in his words without having necessarily an *explicit consciousness* of either the abstractions themselves or of the manner in which the forms embodying them were obtained. Hence in the formation of his propositions he may allow himself to be guided by his rich word-forms to a much greater extent than a race whose words do not embody the same amount of thought. Such races must, in the framing of their propositions, base themselves more directly on the *nature* of the *judgment itself* in order thus to throw into the form of the proposition those essential abstractions which they have, as it were, neglected to express in their word-forms.

In Mundari the division of propositions into two classes is directly based on the *logical nature* of the Predicate-concept. The form of the word denoting that concept has nothing to do with it. This is shown by the following facts:—

- (1) The very same word-form is at one time referred to its Subject by means of the Copula *tan*, at another by means of the Copula *á* (*a*) according to the nature of the concept it denotes. Thus, *horo tan-í* means he is a Munda; *horo-a-e* means he speaks Mundari.

- (2) A certain number of words denoting occupations, offices, etc., are primarily Nouns in Mundari just as they are in Organic languages; v. gr., *Munda*, village-chief; *pahanr*, sacrificer; *manki*, district-chief; *dasi*, servant. Such Nouns may stand as Subjects or Direct and Indirect Objects in a proposition, but they cannot as such perform the function of Predicates. To use them as Predicates, the Munda attaches to them an intransitive function, adds the Perfect Tense-suffix, and then connects them with the Subject by means of the Copula *a*. Thus—

S. C.	Predicate.	Predicate. C. S.
He is the village-chief,—	<i>Munda-akan</i> -a- e;	<i>literally</i> , He is village-chiefed.
He is the district-chief,—	<i>Manki-akan</i> -a- e;	„ He is district-chiefed.
He is a servant,—	<i>Dasi-akan</i> -a- e;	„ He is a-serving.
He is a king,—	<i>Raja-akan</i> -a- e;	„ He is kinged.

Hence the statement that Substantive Predicates are referred to their Subject by means of the Copula *tan* does not mean that every *Mundari Noun* can stand as a Substantive Predicate and take the Copula *tan*. It only means that no Predicate except a Substantive can take the Copula *tan*. It is the *logical nature* of the concept denoted by a Noun which decides whether that Noun can stand as Substantive Predicate, or whether it must assume an intransitive function before it can be used as Predicate at all.

From the Organic point of view, the whole Mundari method of signifying the relation between Subject and Predicate may perhaps at first sight appear rather arbitrary. However, in language there is really nothing either arbitrary or merely conventional. A short examination of the nature of Predicates in general will, I think, show that the Munda's method is perfectly logical, and that what may appear to us anomalous is in reality of a transparent regularity.

The mind throws all its concepts into two great categories: substances and accidents. A *substance* is conceived as a something which has either a real or possible *separate existence* of its own, v. gr., a man, a tree, the sun. If we analyse the concept of a substance, we find it to contain as it were a bundle of characteristics, each of which is conceived as an essentially necessary constitutive element of that particular substance, so that we cannot remove even one of them without destroying that concept as such, v. gr., the concept *plant*

necessarily implies *matter* and *life*; the concept *animal* similarly implies *matter*, *life*, and *sense*; and the concept *man* implies *reason* and *will* in addition to *matter*, *life*, and *sense*. Logicians divide these concepts into the so-called natural genera, species and individualities. *Natural genera* are concepts embracing classes of beings conceived as having certain essential characteristics in common, *v. gr.*, plant, animal. *Natural species* as subdivisions of genera are conceived as sets of beings having in common certain essential characteristics not included in the concept of the genera under which they fall, *v. gr.*, *dog* (under the genus animal). *Individualities* are conceived as possessing, besides the characteristics of a so-called *species infima*, certain characteristics by which they are distinguishable from all the other individuals of that species, *v. gr.*, *this dog*, *that man*.

Accidents are conceived as mere modifications of substances, *i.e.*, as something which cannot have a separate existence of its own, but requires a substance as substratum, a so-called *subject of inherence*. Thus, for instance, we conceive colour as belonging to something and able to exist only in that something. Again, we primarily conceive walking, writing, thinking as the acts or modifications of some agent, some substance. Furthermore, we conceive these modifications as not being part of those essential characteristics which make up our concepts of substances. Though a man has and must have some colour, we do not conceive any particular colour as in any way affecting or modifying humanity as such. This is true even of forms of activity, *the capacity for which* constitutes an *essential characteristic* of a substance. Thus the *capacity* of thinking is conceived as essential in man. But the *actual exercise of it* at any given moment is conceived as merely contingent. Hence the name *accident*, which implies that all the ideas of this category are conceived as contingent, as mere modes of being which whether actually present or not cannot change the intrinsic nature of a substance.

In Organic languages ideas conceived as substances are denoted by *Nouns*, also called *Substantives*. However, not all Nouns denote substances. Thus, for instance, Abstract Nouns, such as *whiteness*, *virtue*, etc., directly denote accidents and connote a particular manner of conceiving them, as shown above. Again, many Concrete Nouns, such as, *v. gr.*, *king*, *servant*, etc., although denoting individuals, are, nevertheless, primarily intended to designate particular accidents as inherent in those individuals. They directly denote offices, occupations, trades, etc., as inherent in certain classes of individuals. The king and the

servant would still remain substantially the same individuals even though their respective social positions were suddenly reversed.

Ideas conceived as accidents are denoted (1) by Adjectives, (2) by Verbs, (3) by Abstract Nouns, and (4) by certain Concrete Common Nouns, as just stated.

Now the office of the Predicate consists entirely and solely in specifying the Subject, *i.e.*, in stating *how* the mind conceives the Subject in a given judgment. Hence in judgments where the Predicate denotes a substance, the mind considers or pictures the Subject in its essentially permanent aspect. In judgments where the Predicate signifies an accident, the mind pictures the Subject in one of its contingent or varying aspects. In doing this the mind implicitly knows that the particular feature it thus pictures is not an intrinsic constituent of Subject's nature or essence.

From a purely logical point of view, therefore, judgments do really fall into two classes, *viz.*, *essential* and *accidental* judgments.

Essential judgments are those in which the Predicate denotes a *substance*.

Accidental judgments are those in which the Predicate denotes an *accident*.

The Kholarians would seem to have transferred this logical division instinctively into their language. For in their propositions they recognize the division (1) *materially* by the adoption of two distinct link-words, one of which, *viz.*, *tan*, is strictly reserved to connect with the Subject only such Predicates as denote substances, whereas the other, *viz.*, *á* (*a*), is used only to connect with the Subject such Predicates as denote accidents. (2) They furthermore recognize the division *formally* by the very meaning of these two link-words.

To judge from the generic functions it performs in the compounds where it occurs, the root *ta* denotes fixity in space and permanence in time in the widest sense. If narrowed down by the Demonstrative *ne* (this), it becomes *tan*. This used intransitively means *to remain*, *to endure*, *to last*, *to be necessarily so or so*, *to be essentially*. Hence the proposition *Horo tani'* would literally mean—He *necessarily* is a man. (The form *taen* is the current word for *to remain*, and as such is an ordinary Intransitive Predicate.)

A' is the current Impersonal Pronoun meaning *it*, *something*. It therefore denotes "being" or "somethingness" in the widest sense, *i.e.*,

that vaguest of all concepts which is equally applicable to substances and accidents. Now, if this be used intransitively, it must mean either *to be something* or *to become something*. That the Copula *á* (*a*) in reality nothing but the Impersonal Pronoun used intransitively will be shown in the Chapter on Mundari equivalents of Organic Verbs (see Grammar, pages 125 to 129). By the fact that *tan* exclusively connotes *substance* in the Predicates which it refers to their Subject, it is sufficiently understood that the kind of *being* connoted by *á* (*a*) in the Predicates it connects with their Subject is a merely accidental mode of being. Hence the proposition *Ne sadom hendega-a-e* literally means: This horse a black-something-he. And if we translate *a* by *is*, we get—This horse black-is-he. *Hijútan* means coming now. Hence *Hijútan-a-ko* literally means: A coming-now-something-they. If we translate *a* by the Organic form *are*, we get: Coming-now-are-they. The word *raja* used transitively means *to make some one king*. *Rajaó* is the Passive Voice, and means to become a king. The Perfect Tense of the Passive Voice is denoted by *akan*. Hence *rajaakan* is a Participial form, literally meaning *rex factus* (who has) become king, *i.e.*, is king now. Hence, he *is* the king must be rendered into Mundari by *Rajaakan-a-e*; literally, a having-become-king-being-he, or having become king *is* he.

The mind frequently forms judgments which are logically quite distinct from those which have just been described; for it often represents things under an aspect which do neither exhibit their substance nor yet any of their inherent accidental modifications. We may, for instance, represent to ourselves a man as *present* in a particular place. Thus we say: the servant is in the garden. Now presence here or there does not affect the substance of the subject nor does it add anything to the accidental modifications which are *inherent* in it. In such judgments the mind simply represents to itself the outward spatial relation of the subject to other real beings. Again, *real existence* as such does not form part of our concept of substances. When, for instance, we think of a future generation of men, we conceive their substance exactly in the same way as we conceive our own. Their coming into existence some day changes nothing in those essential features which make up our concept of a man: nor can we call their existence, when realized, a mere accidental modification of those men. Their existence or coming into actual being is conceived by us as their entering into actual relations with the existing universe. In English this idea of real existence as well as that of presence in, or absence

from, a particular place is generally denoted by the same word which serves as Copula to connect Substantive and Adjective Predicates with their Subjects, viz., by the Substantive Verb *to be*. There *is* a God means—God *exists*. He *is* in the house means he is *present* in the house or he *now exists* in the house. He *is not* in the house means he *is absent* from the house. In these propositions therefore the word *to be* does not perform the office of link-word, but it is by itself alone the real Predicate.

The Munda never uses either of his two link-words to denote existence. This alone goes some way to show that he attaches to both *tan* and *á* (*a*) a meaning which cannot well bear the concept implied in the English word *existence*. It is therefore in its way an argument in favour of the meaning which has been attributed to *tan* and *á* in the preceding pages.

Existence and *non-existence* are, in Mundari, denoted by two quite distinct words: *Mená* means *to exist* and *banó* means *not to exist*. At the same time these two words are generally used to denote presence and absence respectively—*Mená*, *to be present*, and *banó*, *to be absent*. These two words when used intransitively do not, like other Intransitive Predicates, take the Copula *a* before the Personal Pronominal Suffix, but after it—

Mená- <i>iñ-a</i> ,— I exist or I am present.	Bangá- <i>iñ-a</i> ,— I do not exist or I am absent.
Mená- <i>me-a</i> ,— thou exists, thou art present.	Bang- <i>me-a</i> ,— thou doest not exist, etc.
Mená- <i>i-a</i> ,— he or she exists, etc.	Bangá- <i>i-a</i> ,— he or she does not exist.
Mená,— it or they exist, etc.	Bano'- <i>a</i> ,— it does not exist, etc.
Mená- <i>lang-a</i> ,—thou and I exist, etc., etc.	Bang- <i>lang-a</i> ,—thou and I do not exist, etc.

There is in Mundari no Transitive equivalent of the English Verbs *to possess*, *to have*, *to own*. This idea is expressed by *mená* and its contradictory by *banó*. The construction used to predicate possession is similar to the Latin construction in which the Verb *esse* is used to denote possession, viz., the being possessed stands as Subject, whereas the name of the owner stands as Indirect Object, *v.gr.*, I have a horse,—*Equus est mihi*; *Aiñ-á* (to me) *sadom* (a horse) *mená-i-a* (exists), or *Sadom* (a horse) *menáia-taing* (exists to me).

Instead of expressing the idea of presence by means of *mená*, the Mundas very frequently have recourse to a different construction.

The name of the place in which something or some one is present stands first with the Suffix *re, in*. To this is added the required Personal or Impersonal Pronoun, and then the link-word *á*—

They are here,—*Nere-ko-á*.

They are in the house,—*Oráre-ko-á*.

They are there,—*Enre-ko-á*.

They are on the mountain,—*Burure-ko-á*.

What has so far been said about the manner in which the Kholarian mind denotes the relation between Subject and Predicate may be summed up as follows:—

Propositions are divided into two great categories—

- (I) Propositions in which the predication falls directly and solely on the Subject considered in itself alone.
- (II) Propositions in which the predication falls directly on the relations in which the Subject stands to other beings.

The first category of propositions is subdivided into two classes—

- (1) *Essential propositions*, or those in which the Predicate denotes a *substance*. In these the predication falls on the essential and intrinsically necessary features of the Subject.
- (2) *Accidental propositions*, or those in which the Predicate denotes *accidents*. In these the predication falls on such contingent modifications as may be inherent in the Subject.

In the Essential propositions the Predicate is connected with the Subject by means of the Copula *tan*. In the Accidental propositions the Predicate is connected with the Subject by means of the Copula *á (a)*.

These two link-words are not restricted to the bare function of simply connecting the Subject and the Predicate, but they do by their very meaning point out the logical nature of the Predicate. In other words, they point out both *the fact* of the agreement and *the nature* of that agreement; for *tan* denotes a logically necessary agreement between the Subject and the Predicate, whereas *á (a)* implies a merely contingent agreement.

The propositions of the second category predicate, besides existence or non-existence, the space relations of presence or nearness and absence and the relation of ownership in which the Subject may stand to other beings. These relations are denoted by *mená* and *banó* together with the Copula *á (a)*. But the position of the Personal Pronominal

Affixes is, in these Predicates, never the same as in the Accidental propositions of the first category—

I.—Category.

	Pred.	Cop.	Subj.	Subj.	Cop.	Pred.
Ess. Prop.	Horo ...	- tan ...	-i	He ...	is ...	a Munda.
Acc. Prop.	{ Marangge ...	- á ...	-e	He ...	is ...	great.
	{ Rajaakan ...	- a ...	-e	He ...	is ...	a king.
	{ Hijúlen ...	- a ...	-e	He	came.

II.—Category.

	Subj.	Pred.	Pronom.S.	Cop.	Pred.	Subj.	Subj.	Pred.
1. Existence	Pormesor ...	mená ...	-i ...	-a	There is ..	a God or God	... exists.	
2. Presence	{ Soma ...	nere mená	-i ...	-a	}	Soma ...	is here.
	{ Soma ...	ner ...	-i ...	-a				
Subj. Pred. Pronom.S. Cop. Possess.Aff. Possessor.								
3. Possession	{ Sadom mená ...	-i ...	-a ...	-ta ...	-ing	}	Subj. Pred. Dir.Obj.	I ... have ... a horse.
	{ Possessor.Possess.Aff.Subj. Pred.Pronom.S.Cop.							
	Aifi ...	-á ...	sadom mená	... -i ...	-a			

This table shows at a glance how difficult it is for a beginner to translate the English Verb *to be* always correctly into Mundari. Yet it is most important that in this matter mistakes be avoided because the use of the wrong Copula or the use of *mená* instead of the required Copula will frequently change the meaning of the proposition, *v.gr.*—Horo *mená-ia* means—There is a Munda *here*, or the Munda *is present*. Horo *tan-i* means—He is a Munda. Horo *a-e* means—He *can speak* Mundari.

The correct translation of the Verb *to be* is increased still more by a rule which I did not state above. It is this—

Concrete Nouns denoting states, offices, and occupations may in certain cases stand as Predicates, and are then connected with the Subject by means of the Copula *tan*. This happens whenever the speaker intends directly to point out, not the *state*, *office* or *occupation* denoted by the Noun, but the *individuality* of the person who happens to be in that state or office. Thus the question: *What is that man?* is answered by *Rajaakanæ*, *Mundaakanæ*, *dasiakanæ*, etc. He *is a king*, he *is a village-chief*, he *is a servant*, etc. But the question *Who is that man?* is answered by *Raja tant*, *Munda tant*, *dasi tant*, etc. He *is the king*, he *is the village-chief*, he *is the servant*, etc. The reason of this difference in construction is clearly based on the principles exposed above concerning the logical nature of Predicates. In the first set of answers the

Predicate directly points out mere accidental modifications of the Subject in answer to a question concerning the state, office, etc., of the Subject. These answers are therefore *Accidental propositions*. In the second set of answers, on the contrary, the Predicate points out primarily and directly the individuality of the Subject. In them the words *raja*, *munda*, *dasi* are like Proper Nouns. The sentences are equivalent to—That man is the one who is king; that man is the person who is village-chief. The qualifications denoted by the Nouns are here used only for the purpose of clearly pointing out *the individual*. Hence these sentences are *Essential propositions*. In English the Definite and Indefinite Articles will often point out the nature of such Predicates, and thus serve as a guide to the correct use of the Copula, *v.gr.*, in—He is *the* king, the Article shows that here the personality of the king is primarily pointed out; whereas in—He is *a* king, the Article shows that the dignity or office is primarily insisted on.

2.—*Methods of connoting the relation between Transitive or Intransitive Predicates and their Direct or Indirect Objects.*

Transitive and Intransitive Predicates always denote actions in their concrete circumstances, *i.e.*, *real* actions. Even as we cannot conceive a real act of *seeing* without referring it to some subject who does see, so can we not conceive that act without thinking of some object or another which is seen. Similarly, the real act of *giving* implies not only an object which is given, but also a being to whom that object is given. Thus real actions have always one or two *termini*. These are the so-called *Direct* and *Indirect Objects*.

The relation between Transitive or Intransitive Predicates and their Objects bears therefore the same character of a *logical necessity* as the relation between Subject and Predicate.

Organic languages denote this relation by means of special Case desinences in Nouns and Pronouns denoting the Direct and Indirect Objects. In the Predicate itself there is nothing indicative of the relation.

Direct Objects are marked as such by the Accusative Case desinences, *v.gr.*, Rex mittit ministr-um. Rex mittit ministr-os.

Indirect Objects are marked by the Dative Case desinences or by special Demonstrative words (Prepositions and a Case desinence), *v.gr.*, Rex dat pecuniam ministr-o. Rex accepit nuntium a ministr-o.

Modern Organic languages in which the Case desinences have partly or almost wholly succumbed to the action of phonetic decay have chiefly recourse to current Demonstrative words for the purpose of signifying this relation. Besides the use of Case desinences or of current Demonstrative words, juxtaposition is used; for there is a marked tendency to place the Objects immediately after or immediately before the Predicate. However, no very great stress is laid on this factor as an exponent of the relation.

In *Mundari*, on the contrary, the position of the Objects is the sole exponent of the relation; for no kind of affix is ever added to any Noun or Pronoun for the purpose of signifying it.

On this point *Mundari* differs not only radically from Organic, but also from most Agglutinative languages. It is not satisfied with mere immediate juxtaposition, but it *inserts* Pronominal Direct and Indirect Objects *into* the very body of the Predicate-word. Even as the *mental* Object is conceived as a necessary complement of the concept denoting the action, and thus coalesces with that concept into one complete *mental* Predicate, so does the *spoken* Object in *Mundari* coalesce with the term denoting the action into one single *Predicate-word*.

The Pronominal Objects are inserted according to the following rules:—

- (1) In the Definite Present and the Definite Imperfect they stand between the root and the Tense-suffix.
- (2) In all the other Tenses they stand between the complete Tense-form and the copula.

The inserted Pronouns are always the unmodified bare root-forms—

	Predicate.					
	<hr/>					
	Root.	Dr.	Ob.	Tense-suff.	Cop.	Subj.
<i>D. Pr.</i>	Lel	-	ko	-	tan-	a - ing,—I am seeing them now
<i>D. Imp.</i>	Lel	-	ko	-	tantaeken-	a - ing,—I was seeing them then.

	Predicate.					
	<hr/>					
	Root.	Tense-suff.	Dir.	Ob.	Cop.	Subj.
<i>Ind. Pr.</i>	Lel	-	jad'	-	ko	- a - ing,—I see them.
<i>S. Past.</i>	Lel	-	ked'	-	ko	- a - ing,—I saw them.

As already stated, in all Imperfect Tenses the Pronominal *Subjects* are by preference inserted between the original Tense-suffix and the generic Imperfect suffix *taeken*. Thus—

I saw them then ...	{	Lel-ko-tan taeken-a-ing
		or
	{	Lel-ko-tan-ing-taeken-a.
I had seen them ...	{	Lelked'-ko-taeken-a-ing
		or
	{	Lelked'-ko-ing-taeken-a.

In this kind of Mundari proposition therefore all the purely logical relations, viz., those between Subject and Predicate as well as those between the Predicate and its Objects, are welded together into one polysyllabic word, and this word constitutes the whole proposition as such. Any additional words which may be met with are mere explanations of either the Pronominal Subject, or the Predicate, or the Pronominal Direct and Indirect Objects.

As a physical imitation of the mental judgment, this is no doubt driven as close as possible. In itself, however, it is not a perfection; for it renders language heavy and sometimes obscure. Thus, for instance, whenever the Pronominal Subject and Direct Object are in the same Number and Person, the Mundari proposition is ambiguous, though either of the two be explained by an additional Noun. *Raja-e* *lelked'-i-a* may mean "the King saw him" as well as "he saw the King." This construction is another proof that the Kholarian mind has so far been *de facto* unable to grapple successfully with the mind's higher abstractions and the connex problem of translating these into clear and easy language. It exhibits him in a way as unable to clearly formulate the abstract concept of action on the one hand and the abstract concept of the Objects or *termini* of action on the other. He cannot pronounce the word *to see* without *at the same instant* naming in a way the object seen. That this is so is shown by the fact that the Pronominal Objects must be inserted even if the Object is named by some separate Noun or Pronoun in the proposition, *v. gr.*, I saw the *servants*,—*Dasiko-ing* *lelked'-ko-a*. In this respect, then, the Kholarian resembles the Red Indians of America, whose languages are similarly tied down to a slavish imitation of concrete realities.

The following facts seem to indicate that the Kholarians themselves feel this method of expressing the relation between Predicate and Objects as inconveniently heavy:—

(1) If the principle on which the insertion of Direct and Indirect Objects undoubtedly rests were carried out to its entire extent, then a

number of Predicates would have to insert *two* Objects, viz., a *Direct* and an *Indirect* one at the same time. *I give these horses to them* would therefore stand thus: Ne sadomko-ing om-ko-ako-tana. But it was evidently felt that this would be overloading a word and throwing the Tense-suffix too far from the root it specifies. Hence two Objects are never inserted into one and the same Predicate. The speaker in such cases is free to insert either the Direct or the Indirect Object. One of the two must occupy a separate position outside the body of the Predicate. Hence either Ne sadomko-ing om-ako-tanaing (here the Indirect Object is inserted) or Ne sadomko akoti-ing om-ko-tanaing (here the Direct Object is inserted and the Indirect Object stands before the Predicate in the shape of an emphatic Personal Pronoun *ako* with the suffix *tá, to*).

(2) The logically correct practice of distinguishing Indirect Objects by the prefix *a, to*, from Direct Objects is found to interfere too much with euphony in most Tenses. Hence in the Simple Past, instead of leaving this prefix immediately before the Pronominal Object, they throw it before the Tense-suffix. Thus in the sentence *I gave it to them*, we get om-a-ked-ko-aing instead of omked-ako-aing. This transposition is made no doubt because *omkedako* is by itself alone a complete proposition, where *ko* is Subject and *a* Copula and it means *they gave it*. Since this compound would call up that judgment in the mind before the addition of the intended Copula *a* and the Subject *ing* would be pronounced in *omkedakoaing*, they had recourse to the transposition of the prefix *a* in order to avoid that inconvenience. But the form om-a-ked'-ko-aing is never used in its entirety. From the fact that *a* belongs to the Pronominal Object there arises an instinctive hurrying over the Tense-suffix *ked*, and this brings about the elision of the two first letters, *k* and *e*. Hence the current form om-a-d'-ko-aing instead of omaked'koaing.

In the insertion of the 1st and 3rd Persons Singular, viz., *ing* and *i* the Mundas of some districts go a step further in the way of alleviating the overloaded Predicate. By rapidly passing over the letter *d'* and compensating for it by the peculiar jerk represented by the graphic sign (') they obtain the forms omáññae and omáñae, instead of omadiññae and omadiñae,—He gave it *to me* and he gave it *to him*. This process is in its way as strongly Organic as anything we meet with in the treatment of the formative or demonstrative elements by the Aryan languages; for here the whole Tense-suffix is sacrificed to the

principle which requires the insertion of the Pronominal Object into the Predicate. Most Mundas, however, find this process too much for their Agglutinative instincts, and they stick to the forms *omadiña* and *omadia*.

The other Tenses in which the Pronominal Objects stand after the Tense-suffix do not lend themselves to the above transposition and its consequent elisions. The Perfect Tense-form *om-akad* cannot afford an additional *a* before *akad*: *Om-a-akad'ko aing* would be more heavy even than *om-akad-ako-aing*.

In the Indefinite Present *omjad* and the Anterior Past *omled* the transposition would present no more difficulty than in the Simple Past *omked*. But then the result would be that these three tenses become identical in form; for the elision of *ja* and *l* in *om-a-jad'-ko-aing* and *om-a-led'-ko-aing* would lead to *om-a-a'-ko-aing*, which is accepted as the Simple Past form.

Now what does the Munda do in these cases? Rather than throw his troublesome Indirect Object entirely outside the Predicate, he sacrifices the Prefix *a*, *to*, completely and leaves to the listener the trouble of discovering from context or circumstances whether the Simple Personal Pronouns inserted into these Tenses are then and there *Direct* or *Indirect* Objects. Hence—

Omjad'-ko-aing may mean—I gave *them* (to some one), or I gave it *to them*,

Omled'-ko-aing may mean—I first gave *them* (to some one), or I first gave it *to them*.

Omakad'-ko-aing may mean—I have given *them* (to some one), or I have given it *to them*.

The other relations which may arise between the various terms of a proposition are relations of space, time and manner. They are denoted by Postpositions, so-called Adverbs and Numerals. They need not be considered here in detail because the manner in which they are signified does not affect the essential outlines of the proposition.

If now we want to apply the Organic grammatical terminology to the Kholarian mode of signifying the relations arising directly out of

the nature of a judgment, we shall be led to a couple of statements which must at first sight shock our accepted grammatical notions—

I.—*Mundari Nouns, Pronouns and Adjectives have no Nominative, no Accusative, and no Dative Case.* For whatever meaning we may attach to the term *Nominative*, we must admit that it does not apply to Mundari Nouns or Pronouns. If by *Nominative* we mean only that material *word-form* which has arisen out of the combination of the Original Nominative Affix with the Noun's root or theme, as, *v.gr.*, *rex*, *murus*, in contradistinction to the theme, and the other Case-forms, such as *regis*, *regem*, the term cannot be applied to Mundari Nouns and Pronouns because such forms as Root *plus* Nominative Affix or Theme *plus* Nominative Affix do not exist. However, that is hardly the real meaning of our term; for we do not say that all the Nouns and Pronouns of a dictionary stand in the *Nominative Case*, although they there appear in the same form which they have when standing as Subject of a proposition. What we really mean to designate by the term *Nominative Case* is the *function* which that particular *word-form* performs. This function consists in pointing out the Noun or Pronoun as the real Subject of a given proposition, and it is therefore part of the Organic method of denoting the relation between Subject and Predicate. But there is no suffix in Mundari whose function it is to point out any Noun or Pronoun as Subject of the proposition. Nouns and independent Pronouns do not assist by anything in their *form* to denote the relation between Subject and Predicate. The real grammatical Subject in the Mundari proposition is the Personal or Impersonal Pronominal suffix, which stands either at the end of the Predicate or immediately before it. Additional Nouns or Pronouns are, strictly speaking, only specifications of the Pronominal or real Subject. In *dasi hijúlenae* the word "*hijúlenae*" is the grammatically complete proposition; *dasi* explains the Pronominal suffix *e*, as though we said *he*, namely, the servant, *came*.

The same remark applies to the terms *Accusative* and *Dative*; for the whole denotation of the relation between Predicate and Direct or Indirect Objects is exclusively performed by the inserted Pronominal Objects.

In certain cases where the Indirect Objects are thrown out of the Predicate, they are pointed out as such by Postpositions denoting clearly a relation of space. Hence if a *Case* at all, it is a *Locative of motion*.

Add to this the very peculiar manner in which the Organic *Genitive Case* is split up into five different forms, four out of which are pure *Locatives* and only one a genuine *Possessive Case*. V. gr.—

The house of the servant,—Dasi-d ora. The beasts of the forest,—Bir-ren jontuko.

The cattle of the servant,—Dasi-taren uriko. The trees of the forest,—Bir-red daru.

A ring of gold,—Samrom-ra mudam.

If, then, we want to force the terms *Declension* and *Case* on Mundari Nouns and Pronouns, we should say that the whole Mundari Declension consists of a *Possessive Case*, an *Instrumental Case*, and a certain number of *Locatives of rest or motion*.

To say that the *Nominative*, *Dative* and *Accusative* are identical in form is meaningless. If the term *Case* be insisted on, the bare root-form of Nouns might be called the *Indeterminate Case*, inasmuch as that form does not perform any function as regards the denotation of relations. This form may in a certain very restricted sense be called an *Equivalent* of Organic *Nominatives*, *Datives* and *Accusatives*.

II.—If we take the term *Case* as denoting, not a particular word-form, but the grammatical function of signifying the relation between Predicate and Direct and Indirect Objects, then we may say that in Mundari *Transitive* and *Intransitive Predicates* have, besides Voice, Mood and Tense also an *Accusative* and a *Dative Case*. Furthermore, since the relation between Subject and Predicate is exclusively denoted by the Pronominal Subject, we might say that they have also a *Nominative Case*.

III.—The term *Verb* denotes a class of words exclusively denoting states or actions as referred to a subject or agent. We associate with it at the same time that peculiar Organic process which is called *Conjugation*. But Mundari has no particular class of words restricted to that function nor has it a conjugation in our sense of the term.

Mundari equivalents of our Verbs fall under the head of Accidental Predicates as regards their nature, and the mode of connecting them with their Subject is the same as that by which simple Adjectives are connected with the Subject. Hence the term *Verb* can in no sense be applied to them. Those equivalents represent a mere grammatical function. They are *Predicates*. To distinguish them from ordinary *Adjective-Predicates* the qualification *Transitive* or *Intransitive* is added

to them. Hence the term *Transitive* and *Intransitive Predicates* is in these pages substituted for the word *Verb*.

So much for the more striking differences existing between the internal relations of the Mundari and those of the Organic proposition. If now we consider the proposition as a whole, we find that in that respect too Mundari differs strongly from the Aryan methods.

Besides the *Simple Proposition*, we have in Organic languages Compound Propositions or Sentences. In these there is one *Principal Proposition* with its own Subject and Predicate and one or more *Subordinate Propositions* with their own Subjects and Predicates. *V. gr.*, the man (*Subj.*) who (*Subj.*) gave (*Pred.*) you this letter is an Uraon (*Pred.*). Though this sentence signifies but one single judgment or mind-picture, it contains two Subjects and two Predicates. We understand that the whole of the above Relative Clause is but an explanation of the real or *Principal Subject* of the judgment.

But the Munda never tolerates more than one Subject and one Predicate in even the most complex proposition. Subordinate clauses with special Subjects and Predicates can never occur in a Mundari Proposition. It is here that he brings into play his numerous Tense-forms. By using them either with a Substantive, an Adjective or an Adverbial function he obtains compounds which, with or without additional suffixes, render any of our subordinate clauses.

It is exceedingly difficult for a foreigner to translate compound Organic sentences fluently and correctly into Mundari: when he has acquired a certain facility in this matter, he may not yet flatter himself with the idea that he will understand all those perplexing compounds as fast as they drop from the Munda's lips. Often and often he will have to acknowledge to himself that he does not know what his interlocutor is driving at, though every word of the sentence sounds familiar to him. Nothing but a prolonged intercourse with Mundas can help him over this difficulty. To get into a correct rendering from English into Mundari, the following is the safest and the shortest method, though apparently rather long. *First*, translate your subordinate clause into a complete Mundari proposition; *then* cut off the Copula and the Pronominal subject; *finally*, place the remnant thus obtained in its proper place of the Mundari principal proposition. *Ex.*, "The man *who brought this letter* is an Uraon." Since there are no Relative Pronouns

in Mundari, all English Relatives must be replaced by corresponding Personal Pronouns.' Hence *Who brought this letter* becomes *he brought this letter*,—*Ne chiti-e* (*Sub.*) *auked-a* (*Pred.*). Throw out *e* and *a* and you obtain *Ne chiti auked*, these three words being a qualificative of the Subject: *The man, horo*, precede that word. Hence—

Subject.	Pred.	Cop.	Pr. Subj.
<u>Ne-chiti auked horo</u>	Uraon	tan	-i

The man *who gave this letter to you* is a Hindu. He gave this letter to you—*Ne chiti omad'me-a-e*. Cut off the Cop. *a* and the Subj. *e*:

Subject.	Pred.	Cop.	Pr. Subj.
<u>Ne chiti omad'me horo</u>	Diku	tan	-i

I saw the men *who beat him*. They beat him,—*dalki-a-ko* (here *i* is the Pronominal Dir. Object). Cutt off the Copula *a* and the Pron. Subj. *ko*. Hence—

Direct Object.	Predicate.	Cop.	Subj.
<u>Dalki horoko</u>	leiked'ko	a	-ing

or *Dalki horoko-ing leiked'koa*. *Literally*, the him having beaten men I saw them.

An additional difficulty arises in other kinds of subordinate clauses where the Tense-form, severed from its Copula and Pronominal Subject, requires other modifying suffixes. This of course pre-supposes a knowledge of the functions performed by the various Postpositions. In those propositions we meet turns which defy every attempt at anything like an approximatively literal translation into English.

A last peculiarity of the Mundari proposition is the absence of the so-called *Oratio obliqua* or *Indirect Speech*. The words of a third person are always left in the *direct form*. This necessitates the *co-ordination* of two complete propositions into one sentence. It is the only instance of a Mundari sentence containing *two Subjects, two Predicates, and two Copulas*.

The sentence *He said he would come to-morrow* must, in Mundari, be turned as follows : *I will go to-morrow*, saying he said,—Gapa-ing sen-a mente (saying) kajilá-e.

He affirms that he never saw you, becomes, *I never saw him*, saying he affirms. This construction is very simple in itself. It eliminates the last trace of the troublesome *sequence of Tenses* from the syntax. But it requires some attention on the part of the foreigner to make the requisite transposition of words when he translates from English into Mundari. A slight mistake in this matter would make him say what he never intended to.

It will readily be perceived that the method to be followed in a Mundari grammar must differ widely from that which is usually followed in the elementary grammars of Organic languages. A rigorous adhesion to the divisions and classifications of those grammars would create difficulties where there are none, and give the appearance of anomalies to forms and constructions which are but the logical consequences of the principles on which the language is based.

As regards the *terminology* used in Organic grammars, very little of it applies to Mundari if taken in its current meaning. It is to be hoped that the rapidly increasing study of non-Aryan languages may soon create a rational terminology which will be applicable to Isolating and Agglutinative as well as to Organic languages. This ought not to present great difficulties if the terms to be partly selected and partly created be based exclusively on the *functions* performed by the various Predicative and Formative or Demonstrative elements and on the *ideal relations* existing between the constituents of a judgment; for *functions* and *relations* being purely mental and abstracting from the material word-form, are fundamentally the same in all languages.

Some of our terms, such as *Noun* and *Pronoun*, can hardly be objected to from that point of view; whereas others would undoubtedly have to be modified. Thus *Adjectives* are not always mere qualifying additions to Nouns, because they may stand as Predicates of a proposition. The term *Verb* is unfortunate even in Organic languages, since it really indicates neither a grammatical function nor the outward form of the particular class of words it designates. The mere fact of their occurring more frequently as Predicates does not entitle those words being called *the word par excellence*. Functionally it belongs to the same class of Predicates to which ordinary Qualificatives (Adjectives) belong. *Adverb* is a very inadequate term even in those

languages which use the term *Verb*. For it there is applied not only to words which *modify* Verbs, but also to words which modify Adjectives, *v. gr.*, *slightly bitter*. *Preposition* and *Postposition* again do neither touch the function nor the form of the class of Demonstratives they designate. They merely point out their relative position with regard to other words.

A common terminology serving to give an accurate analytic description of *the proposition* in all languages may appear to offer more serious difficulties owing to the very divergent methods used by different groups of languages for the purpose of expanding, explaining or modifying either the Subject or the Predicate. If, however, the fact that the most complex and complicated sentences of any language have always only *one main Subject* and *one main Predicate* and that everything else in the sentence is for a particular purpose grouped around these **two** essential constituents,—if, I say, this fact were made the exclusive basis of the common terminology, the difficulty would be found more apparent than real. But until a universal terminology be really adopted, the creation of new terms for a comparatively insignificant language, such as Mundari is, would probably cause more confusion than the use of the Organic terms with such modifications in their current meanings as the character of Mundari necessarily implies. Thus, *v. gr.*, the terms *Noun*, *Adjective*, *Adverb*, etc., must be understood to denote, not word-forms, but simply *grammatical functions*. *Clause* never denotes a subordinate proposition with a Subject and Predicate of its own, but merely a compound word with or without additional words which stand as mere Qualificatives or Modifiers or Expansions of either Subject or Predicate.

That in Mundari Etymology and Syntax coincide, so to say, completely is evident enough. Hence a division of the grammar into Etymology and Syntax is out of the question. The method best adapted to the character of the language appears to be the following:—

The whole subject is divided into four parts—

The First Part treats of the so-called Demonstratives. Beginning with the Simplest Demonstratives, it gives their signification and shows how the simple forms concur to form Compound Demonstratives. It contains eight chapters, *viz.*, (1) Definite, Indefinite, and Interrogative Demonstratives used adjectively, (2) Personal Pronouns, (3) Definite Indefinite, and Interrogative Pronouns, (4) Postpositions,


(5) Numerals, (6) Words used adverbially, (7) Conjunctions, (8) Interjections.

The Second Part shows how Simple and Compound Demonstratives concur with Nouns and Pronouns to form compounds equivalent to Organic declensional or Case-forms. *The formation of Possessive Adjectives and Possessive Pronouns as well as of certain Nouns falls in naturally with the subject-matter of this part. To this is added a word on the degrees of comparison in Adjectives.

The Third Part treats of the manner in which Demonstratives concur with Predicative roots to form equivalents of Organic conjugational forms. It considers these compounds as Transitive or Intransitive Predicates, and therefore comprises chapters on Mood, Voice and Tenses. It considers them next as performing various other functions with or without additional Demonstrative suffixes.

The Fourth Part explains how the Tense-forms are used as subordinate clauses in propositions.

A few necessary remarks on the Mundari vowels and consonants, and on grammatical Gender, Number, and the distinction between living beings and inanimate objects precede the first chapter of the First Part.



MUNDARI VOWELS AND CONSONANTS.

THE vowels *a, e, i, o, u* are pronounced as in Latin or German.

Any two vowels may stand side by side: *ae, ai, ao, au, ea, ei, eo, eu*, etc. When thus occurring together each vowel retains its original sound. Fusions of two vowels into a new sound, such as occur, *v. gr.*, in the English word *broad*, do not exist, nor are two vowels together used to form a long one. Each vowel is either long, short, or neutral, *i.e.*, so short that it is difficult to distinguish between an *ä* and an *ë*.

All the vowels may be nasalized. In that case I use the mark *̃* after the vowels, *v. gr.*, *añri*, a fig-tree; *cheñre*, a bird. They occur only before *ç* and *r*.

The semi-vowels *y* and *w* are rare. *y* is used only instead of *e* when this occurs between two vowels, *v. gr.*, *loyong* for *loeong*, a rice-field. *w* takes the place of *o* between two vowels, *v. gr.*, *hewa* for *heoa*, accustom.

The consonants *f, x, and z* do not exist.

g is always pronounced like the *g* in *good*, never like the *g* in *George*.

j is a purer sound than the English *j*. It may be said to stand between the German and the English *j*; but it has nothing of the French *j*. The same remark applies to *ch*.

d and *t* are pure dentals as in German, hence different from the English sounds.

r is always pronounced distinctly as in German, never like the affected French guttural.

s is a sharp palatal rather than a dental consonant.

n (1) in the beginning of a word is pronounced like the English *n* in *never*.

(2) In connection with a dental it becomes a pure dental.

(3) When it precedes the consonants *g* or *k* it is pronounced like the *n* in the English *ring* and the German *Enkel*.

In this conjunction of *n* and *g*, the *g* is pronounced like in the English *ring* when it is the last letter of the word; but when it is followed by another letter, the *g* is pronounced somewhat harder like in the English *linger*, *v. gr.*, *dungui*, short. With regard, however, to this combination of *ng* and *nk*, attention must be paid to the following rules :—

(1) When the vowel following *g* is the first part of a distinct Suffix, *v. gr.*, the Perfect Tense Suffix *akan*, then the *g* is pronounced like the *g* in the word *English* or the German word *Engel*, *v. gr.*, *dinga-kana*,—full of water.

(2) When the *n* preceding the consonants *g* or *k* belongs to the Demonstrative Prefix *en* that, then the *n* must be pronounced as a distinct dental, *v. gr.*, *enkate*=*en-kate*, that way or thus; *inku*=*en-ko*; *literally*, that they, *i.e.*, those.

In this we see the instinctive tendency of an Agglutinative language trying to preserve the primary root against even the slightest encroachments on the part of secondary roots.

I do not think it necessary to adopt a diacritic mark for the purpose of distinguishing between the cases where the *n* and *g* or *k* sounds are preserved quite pure, and those where they are, so to say, melting into each other, because a slight knowledge of the language will naturally lead a foreigner to observe the above rules.

Besides the *n* described above, there exists in Mundari the so-called *n mouillé*. This I write *ñ*. It is used when the Pronoun *aing* or *ing* of the first Person Singular is followed by the Suffix *á*, *v. gr.*, the Possessive *aiñá*, to me or of me, my; *kaiñá*,—I won't.

To the above consonants must be added the cerebrals *ḍ*, *ṭ* and *ṛ*, which is readily interchanged with *ḍ*. We might add *ṇ*, which is used to transform ordinary vowels into nasals before *ḍ* and *ṛ*.

h occurs both in the beginning as well as in the body of words, *v. gr.*, *horo*, man; *mahara*, cowherd.

Moreover, all consonants may take the aspirate; hence *dh* and *ḍh*, *th* and *ṭh*, etc.

It is a curious fact that the Mundas of the Mankipati districts, who are generally not acquainted with Hindi or Sadhani, frequently drop the aspirate in adopted Hindi words.

It is difficult for most Europeans to get into a correct pronunciation of the aspirate consonants, and especially of the cerebrals *č*, *ť*, *ř*, and *ň*. But it is, I believe, quite impossible for any foreigner to acquire a perfectly correct pronunciation of the peculiarly checked vowels which occur so frequently in Kholarian languages. All the vowels may be thus checked. This peculiar sounding of the vowels may be described as follows: The pronunciation of a vowel, commenced in the ordinary way, is suddenly checked by a rapid partial contraction of the muscles used in its formation, and then, by a relaxation of those muscles the breath or sound is allowed to flow out without receiving any further modulation.

This process gives to the vowel the sound of two vowels, of which the first is very distinct, smart, and short; whereas the second sounds somewhat like a slight short echo of the first. I represent these sounds by a wedge-shaped apostrophe above the letter, in order to distinguish it from the ordinary apostrophe: *á é í ó ú. á*, a bow, sounds somewhat like *a-á*, *dé*, to climb *de-ě*. The consonants *b* and *d* preceded by vowels are frequently treated in the same manner. For *d* this is the case not only at the end of words, but also each time that this letter is followed by a *k* or a *t* in the middle of a word, *v. gr.*, *ub'*, hair; *med'*, eye; *had'*, to cut. *Ked* is the Simple Past Tense Suffix. The *d* of this becomes *d'* in *v. gr.* *lelkeď'koing*,—I saw them; *lelkeď'te*,—having seen it. The consonant *b'* thus checked sounds somewhat as though it were followed by a slight *m*; *ub'*=*ub-m*. The consonant *d'* sounds as if it were followed by a slight *n*, *med'*=*med-n*. In reality, however, there is neither an *m* nor an *n* attached to these consonants. These *m*-and-*n*-like echoes arise naturally from the flow of the breath after the check whilst the lips and tongue are still in that position in which they were when the formation of the consonants *b* and *d* was commenced.

The consonant *t* in *et'kan*, bad, seems to undergo the same check. The checking of *d* in the Tense-suffixes before *k* and *t* seems to be used for the purpose of preserving this final letter of a tense-form which would otherwise naturally become *t* before and in contact with *k* and *t*.

These checks disappear and reappear in certain connections in a manner which seems to be almost arbitrary. Again, some Mundas will use them where others do not use them. As I have so far not been able to fully ascertain the laws which regulate them, it would hardly be of use to put down here such observations as I have been able to make.

In dissyllabic words the accent is generally on the first syllable even when the last syllable is checked, *v. gr.*, *lija*, a cloth; *rebed'*, squeeze. There are few exceptions to this rule. They must be learned by practice. I have so far not ascertained the reason of the accentuation of the last syllable in those words. In general it may be said that accentuation is by far not as pronounced as in German or English. Barring some very short vowels, the accentuated has hardly more stress than the non-accentuated syllable.

The law of harmony of vowels which plays such a prominent part in Ural-Altaic languages has comparatively little influence in Mundari. Vowels of Tense-suffixes, for instance, never change for the purpose of harmonizing with the root-vowel, *do-akad*, *dé-akad*, *ti-akad*, *mu-akad*.

However, some vowel-changes are evidently traceable to this law. *V. gr.*, the Plural *kuriku* used as well as *kuriko*. Again, *ini*- instead of *en-i*, etc.

There is neither a *Definite* nor an *Indefinite Article* in Mundari. The context in which a Noun occurs must decide whether that Noun, when rendered into English, should be preceded by the Definite or by the Indefinite Article. Thus—

horo may mean, *the man* or *a man*.

horoko may mean, *the men* or *men*.

REMARK.—The Numeral *mid'* or *miad'*, *one*, is often used, especially in narrations, where, in English, the *Indefinite Article a, an* or the phrase *a certain* would stand.

GENDER.

Mundari does not recognise *Grammatical Genders*. Hence—

- (1) Nouns do not take any suffixes indicative of Gender.
- (2) One and the same pronominal form denotes both male and female beings. Thus, *Aé* means *he* as well as *she*; *ko* means *they*, *i.e.*, the French *ils* or *elles*; *ni* means *this one*, *i.e.*, both *celui-ci* as well as *celle-ci*.
- (3) One and the same adjective form is used to qualify Nouns denoting male or female or neuter beings. Thus, *bugin* apu, a good father; *bugin* enga, a good mother; *bugin* orá, a good house.

The only Mundari Nouns connoting sex are the patronymics, *i.e.*, words denoting family relations. The following is, so far as I could ascertain, a complete list of those words:—

apu, father, vocative, *aba!*; *enga*, mother, vocative, *eang!* (aiang).

horo, man, husband; *kuri*, woman, wife.

herel, husband; *era*, wife; *bau*, senior brother; *misí*, senior sister.

ara, son-in-law, also junior brother-in-law; *kimin*, daughter-in-law, also junior sister-in-law.

hatom, senior paternal aunt, *i.e.*, father's senior sister, or wife of father's senior brother.

gari, junior aunt, *i.e.*, father's junior sister or wife of father's junior brother.

hili, senior sister-in-law.

guiram is used by *men* only when speaking of or to the brothers of their sister-in-law.

nataia is used by *women* only when speaking of or to the wife of their brother-in-law. In other words, women who are married to brothers call each other *nataia*.

sadigi is used by *men* when speaking of or to the husband of a sister-in-law.

Two men having married sisters call each other *sadigi*.

boko denotes both a junior brother and a junior sister.

honjar denotes both a *senior* brother-in-law and a senior sister-in-law.
tenja denotes both a *junior* brother-in-law and a junior sister-in-law. It is used by *men* speaking of or to their wife's junior brothers or sisters.
irul denotes both a *junior* brother-in-law and a junior sister-in-law. It is used by *women* speaking of or to their husband's junior brothers or sisters.
hon denotes a child as well as the young one of any animal irrespective of sex.
sumdi denotes both the parents and the uncles and aunts of a son-in-law or a daughter-in-law.

To distinguish between the male and female beings denoted by the words just enumerated, the words *koṛa*, man, and *kuri*, woman, are added, respectively—

<i>boko-koṛa</i> , junior brother.	<i>boko-kuri</i> , junior sister.
<i>tenja-koṛa</i> , junior brother-in-law.	<i>tenja-kuri</i> , junior sister-in-law.
<i>irul-koṛa</i> , junior brother-in-law.	<i>irul-kuri</i> , junior sister-in-law.
<i>hon-koṛa</i> , son.	<i>hon-kuri</i> , daughter.
<i>sumdi-koṛa</i> , father or uncle of one's daughter or son-in-law.	<i>sumdi-kuri</i> , mother or aunt of one's son or daughter-in-law.

N.B.—The word *honjar* prefixes the words *bau* and *miṣi*; *bau-honjar*, senior brother-in-law; *miṣi honjar*, senior sister-in-law.

The words *koṛa* and *kuri* are more generally placed before the word *hon*: thus, *koṛa-hon* oftener than *hon-koṛa*, son; *kuri-hon* oftener than *hon-kuri*, daughter.

To complete their catalogue of patronymics the Mundas have borrowed the following terms from the Hindus. In these words the masculine gender is connoted by the ending *a* or *u*, the feminine by *i*—

<i>aja</i> , paternal or maternal grandfather.	<i>aji</i> , paternal or maternal grandmother, also senior sister.
<i>dada</i> , senior brother. (This is the vocative of address to the Mundari word <i>bau</i> .)	<i>dai</i> , senior sister. (Vocative of address to the Mundari word <i>miṣi</i> .)
<i>baṛa</i> , senior paternal uncle.	<i>baṛi</i> , senior paternal aunt.
<i>kaka</i> , junior paternal uncle.	<i>kaki</i> , junior paternal aunt.
<i>mamu</i> , senior or junior maternal uncle.	<i>mami</i> , senior or junior maternal aunt.
<i>kuku</i> , one's aunt's husband.	<i>kukui</i> , paternal uncle's wife.
<i>aji-hanar</i> , senior sister-in-law, <i>i.e.</i> , one's wife's senior sister.	

N.B.—This last is a combination of Hindi and Mundari, and corresponds to the term *bau-honjar*.

There exist a few terms destined chiefly to connote the age of domestic animals or the work they are used for. Of these, some do at the same time connote sex—

<i>haṛa</i> , a bullock used for ploughing.	<i>gundi</i> , a cow used for ploughing.
<i>naunṛki</i> , a female buffalo.	<i>paṭia</i> , a female goat not yet bearing.
<i>gaia</i> , a capon.	<i>kaluti</i> , a grown chicken not yet laying.
<i>uri</i> , denotes both cattle in general and bullocks in particular.	

The words *andia*, bull; *bacha*, a young bull; *gai*, cow; *bhains*, buffalo cow; *bakra*, he-goat; *khassi*, gelded goat; *boda*, he-goat, are borrowed from Hindi.

If required to distinguish between the sex of animals, the words *sandi*, male, or *enga*, female, are placed before the Nouns denoting animals. Thus—

Sim, fowl; *sandi-sim*, cock; *enga-sim*, hen.

Sadom, horse; *sandi-sadom*, stallion; *enga-sadom*, mare.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN LIVING BEINGS AND INANIMATE OBJECTS.

The distinction between living beings and inanimate objects is constantly attended to, and from a grammatical point of view is most important; for it regulates the Grammatical Numbers and thus plays a conspicuous part in the formation of those compounds which are the equivalents of Organic Declensions and Conjugations.

All heavenly bodies as well as the causes of natural phenomena, such as rain, thunder, lightning, hail, are considered as living beings: hence the Munda says: *He* rains, etc. On the other hand, plants are treated as inanimate objects.

GRAMMATICAL NUMBERS.

1st. Nouns denoting living beings have three Numbers—the *Singular*, the *Dual*, and the *Plural*.

2nd. Personal Pronouns, *i.e.*, those which stand for Nouns denoting living beings, have *distinct forms* for the Singular, the Dual, and the Plural.

3rd. Other Pronouns standing for Nouns denoting living beings form their *Dual* and *Plural* like the Nouns they stand for.

4th. Nouns denoting inanimate objects have, generally speaking, no *Dual* and *Plural*.

5th. Pronouns standing for Nouns denoting inanimate objects have no *Dual* and *Plural* forms.

6th. Adjectives never take the *Dual* or *Plural* suffixes whether they qualify Nouns denoting living beings or inanimate objects.

woman is supposed to use the Dual form of the Personal Pronoun. V. gr., *Sena-ben* chi *ka-ben* *sena*? instead of *Sena-m* chi *ka-m* *sena*?—Wilt *thou* go?

It would be considered both rude and indecent were any one to address a married woman with the Singular form of the second person. Husbands may use the Singular form, but even they generally observe the above rule.

The Dual form of the Pronoun is also very frequently used when speaking of married women in the third person. V. gr., *Ka-king* *sena* instead of *Ka-e* *sena*,—She will not go. Hence also *niking* instead of *ni*, this (woman), *celle-ci*; *inking* instead of *in*, that (woman), *celle-là*.

This peculiarity is the more striking, because the Mundas not only have none of the ceremonial or polite forms which abound in some other Agglutinative languages, but they never even use any honorific Plural or Dual of address. *Am*, *thou* is used to address superiors as well as equals and inferiors. The reason of this peculiar use of the Dual lies in the manner in which the Munda conceives the family, viz., as a moral unity. Hence the wife always includes her husband in the Pronoun of the first person. *Aling* in fact means literally *he* and *I*. That this is the real reason will be shown fully lower down where the Possessive Suffixes are explained.

Very frequently unmarried girls use the Dual forms of themselves in the same manner. But this is not general, and evidently arises only from a desire of aping their seniors.

DEMONSTRATIVES AND INTERROGATIVES USED AS ADJECTIVES.

I.—Definite Demonstratives.

The following, when used adjectively, occupy an independent position in the proposition, *i.e.*, they are neither suffixes nor prefixes.

They stand before the word they qualify and never take any suffix indicative of Number.

ne, this; *en*, that; *han*, yonder, that . . yonder; *nimin*, this much of, this number of; *niminang*, just this much; *imin*, that much, so much; *iminang*, just that much, just so many.

The forms *nimin* and *imin* qualify Nouns denoting living beings, whereas *niminang* and *iminang* qualify Nouns denoting inanimate objects.

Ne hōro, this man; *ne* sadomking, these two horses; *en* honko, those children; *han* daru, yonder tree; *niminung* bulung, this much of salt; *imin* simko, just so many fowls.

REMARK.—The stronger forms *hen* for *en*, *niminung* for *niminang* and *iminung* for *iminang* occur very often.

The forms *nendūr* or *nendūro*, *handūr* and *handūro* occur chiefly in the dialect of the Larkas.

NOTE 1.—*Ne*, *en* (*hen*) and *han* appear to be but different modulations of one and the same root; the changes in the position and strength of the vowels serving to mark the relative distance of the object pointed out. The aspirate *ha*, placed before the consonant *n*, indicates a very great distance. To point out an object that is less distant, *ha* is softened down into *he* or more frequently into *e*. To point out something that is quite close to the speaker, this *e* is still further weakened by being thrown behind the consonant *n*. Thus, then, the consonant is the unvarying element of the simple Definite Demonstrative root. This *n* occurs in many compounds both as infix and suffix as a specifying or limiting agent. The power of expressing proximity or distance by mere vowel changes is not limited to Mundari. Max Müller in "Turanian Languages" says it is shared by several Agglutinative languages, *cf.* Canarese; *ivanu*, this one; *avanu*, that one.

2. *Nimin* and *imin* are compounds of *ne min* and *en min*; literally, *this much*, *this many*, and *that much* or *that many*. In *nemin* the stronger vowel *i* influences the weaker *e* so as to harmonize it with the vowel *i*. In *en min* the same influence is exerted over the *e* by *i*, and then the *n* being thrown out for euphony's sake the form *imin* is obtained.

Hence *min* may be considered as a Definite Demonstrative of quantity, whether continuous or discrete.

3. The forms *nendūr* and *handūr* may perhaps be a combination of the Mundari *ne* and the Hindi *idhar*; literally, *this here*, and of the Mundari *han* and the Hindi *udhar*; literally, *that* or *yonder there*.

When Mundas borrow from the Hindi, they generally replace aspirate letters by the corresponding simple ones. They not unfrequently add a vowel in harmony with the root-vowel of the adopted word.

4. *Ne* occurs as Definite Demonstrative with but slight modifications in a number of Agglutinative languages.

II.—Indefinite Demonstratives.

N.B.—The abbreviations (l. b.) and (i. o.) stand for the words *living beings* and *inanimate objects* respectively.

The Adjectives marked below by the abbreviation (l. b.) are used to qualify Nouns denoting living beings; those marked by the abbreviation (i. o.) qualify Nouns denoting inanimate objects.

The following, placed before Nouns, perform the function of Indefinite Demonstrative Adjectives, and as such never take any suffix indicative of Number:—

Oko, some; *ja* (l. b.), any at all; *jan* (i. o.), any at all; *jeta* (l. b.), some; *jetan* (i. o.), some, any; *mid'* (*miad'*, *mod'* *moiad'*), some, one *tara*, several; *tara tara* or *tatara* and *taramara*, many; *isu*, much, many; *pu á*, much, many; *isu purá*, very much, very many; *huring* or

hupuring, little, few; *hupuring*, very little, very few; *oró*, *odó* or *ondó*, more; *jad'ka*, more; *huringleka*, a little, a few; *nimpirang* or *nimpirung*, this little, as little as this; *jaiminang* or *jaiminung*, any amount of, any number of.

Ja hoŕo, any man at all; *jan kami*, any work whatever; *oko honko*, some children; *Purá diri*, many stones.

REMARK.—The enclitic *ge* is always suffixed to the above Demonstratives in short replies to questions, where the Noun specified by the Interrogatives in the question is understood, but not expressed in the answer.

Chimin hoŕoko senako? How many men will go? *Puráge*, many; *Oró* ehauling omamea? Shall I give you more rice? *Oróge*, yes, more.

III.—Interrogative Demonstratives.

The following placed before Nouns perform the function of Interrogative Adjectives, and, as such, remain always unchanged:—

Oko? What? *Chikan*? What kind or what sort of? *Chilekan*? Of what quality? *Literally*, what like? *Chimin*? (l. b.) How many? *Chiminang*? (i. o.) How many? How much?

Oko? is an Indefinite Adjective; all the others are Definite.

REMARK.—*Chimin* is chiefly used to qualify Nouns denoting living beings; *Chiminang* chiefly qualifies Nouns denoting inanimate objects. This distinction, however, is not always rigorously observed.

The other Interrogatives are used indiscriminately both with Nouns denoting living being and with those denoting inanimate objects.

NOTE 1.—*Chi* is an interrogative particle used both as suffix and as prefix. When suffixed to the last word of a proposition, it transforms that proposition into an interrogative one *v. gr.*, *Hoŕoko hijútanako* means,—The men are coming; *Hoŕoko hijútanakochi*? means,—Are the men coming?

As prefix it is used only to form Interrogative Compounds.

2. *Kan* is the equivalent of *tan*, which, as stated in the Introduction, is used as Copula when the Predicate of a proposition is a Noun or Pronoun. It is therefore best rendered by the English *is* or *it is*, in its copulative meaning.

Leka means like, similar.

Hence *Chikan*? is a compound of the interrogative particle *chi* and the Copula *kan*, and means literally *what is it*? This Adjective then enquires after the *kind* or *class* to which something belongs.

Chilekan? is a compound of three words, viz., the Particle *chi*, the word *leka* and the Demonstrative *en*, that, the vowel of the latter being dropped. Hence it literally means,—What like that? Therefore it enquires after the *quality* of something.

Chimin, a compound of the interrogative *chi* and the quantitative *min* literally means: how many? how much?

Chiminang is possibly a compound of *chi*, *min*, and *ena*, the Neuter Demonstrative Pronoun, *that*. If so, it literally means how much that, i.e., how much of that. This might account for the form being chiefly used with Nouns denoting inanimate objects—

Oko hoŕo? What man? *Hani*?, Yonder one.

Chikan hoŕoko? What kind or class or race of men? *Mundako*, *Mundas*.

Chilekan hoŋo? What sort of man? *Salangi esel* hoŋo,—A tall, fair man.

Chimin sadomko? How many horses? *Chiminang* daru? How many trees?

Chiminang chauli? How much rice?

II.—PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

1.—Simple Personal Pronouns.

The Personal Pronoun of the first person has two distinct forms both for the Dual and for the Plural. The first of these may be called the *Inclusive*, and the second, the *Exclusive* form.

The *Inclusive Dual* comprises the speaker and the person spoken to. Hence it should be rendered into English by—*thou and I*.

The *Inclusive Plural* comprises the speaker and two or more persons spoken to; hence it means *you and I*.

The *Exclusive Dual* excludes the person spoken to: it comprises the speaker and some person distinct from the one who is addressed. Hence it means, *He and I* or *she and I*.

The *Exclusive Plural* excludes the person or persons addressed; it comprises the speaker and two or more persons distinct from those who are spoken to. Hence it means *They and I*.

I consider the following as the original Personal Pronouns, and therefore as complete roots and not as mere truncations of the Emphatic Personal Pronouns—

Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
1st Pers., <i>ing</i> , I.	{ Inclus., <i>lang</i> , thou and I. Exclus., <i>ling</i> , he and I, she and I.	<i>bu</i> , you and I. <i>le</i> , they and I.
2nd Pers., <i>me</i> , thou.	<i>ben</i> , you two.	<i>pe</i> , you.
3rd Pers., <i>i</i> , he or she.	<i>king</i> , both, the two.	<i>ko</i> , they.
Impers. or Neut., <i>á</i> , it (i.o.).	<i>á</i> , both (i.o.).	<i>á</i> , they (i.o.).

These forms never occupy an independent position in the Proposition: they are essentially *suffixes* or *infixes*.

The following rules must be observed regarding their position:—

1st.—When they stand as *Subject of a Proposition*, they must be suffixed either to the Copula or to the word which immediately precedes the Predicate—

Pred.	Cop.	Subj.	Adv. Subj.	Pred.	Cop.
Hijulen - a -	ko,	—they came.	Hola - ko	hijulen - a,	—They came yesterday.

N. B.—These Pronominal Subjects when suffixed to Mundari Transitive or Intransitive Predicates give the latter a semblance of a conjugation. Hence beginners are inclined to

always suffix them to the Copula. The Mundas by preference suffix them to the word immediately preceding the Predicate. It may even be stated as a general rule that they *must* be suffixed to Adverbs which may happen to immediately precede the Predicate. The same rule holds good of the Negative Particle *ka*, not, which in Negative Propositions always stands immediately before the Predicate, except in sentences where a Vocative of Address is used. In that case the Vocative frequently stands immediately after the Particle *ka*: thus—*ka gomke-ling sena!*—Sir, he and I will not go.

REMARK.—To every Mundari Tense there corresponds an *Imperfect* which is obtained by adding *taeken* to the original Tense. When any of these Imperfects occur, the Mundas generally suffix the Simple Pronominal Subjects to the original Tense-form, so as to stand between it and the Suffix *taeken*. Here, then, it is *infix*ed into the Predicate—

Def. Pres.	Subj.	Imp. T. S. Co.
loltan	- <i>ing</i>	taeken - a, I was seeing it then.
loltan	- <i>em</i>	taeken - a,* thou wast seeing it then.
loltan	- <i>e</i>	taeken - a, he was seeing it then.

REMARK.—When Nouns are used intransitively to denote either motion or rest, they take the Postpositions *te*, to, *tate*, towards, or *re*, in, *täre*, about; then they infix the Pronominal Subject between these Postpositions and the Copula *a*. Thus—

Pred. Subj. Cop.

Oräte - ko - a; *literally*, to the house they it is, they to-the-house it, *i.e.*, they go home.

Oräre - ko - a; „, in the house they it is, they in-the-house it, *i.e.*, they are in the house.

Pronominal Subjects occupy the same position when they stand as Subject either to the Predicates *mená*,—to exist, to be present; *banó*,—not to exist, to be absent; or to Adverbs of Place. Thus *mená-ko-a*, they are present; *bang-ko-a*, they are absent. *Nere* means *here*; *nete* means *this way*, *okore?* means *where?* Hence *nere-ko-a*: they are here; *nete-ko-a*,—they come *this way*; *okore-ko-a?*—where are they?

In the existing Present and Past tenses of this kind, the Pronominal Subject stands before the Tense-sign. Thus—

Hente-ko-jan-a,—they went that way.

However, the Perfect of *mená*, viz., *menákan* never infixes Pronominal Subjects, but follows the general rule of ordinary Predicates. Thus, *menákanje-a-ko*,—they continue there or here.

2nd.—When they stand as Direct Object to a Transitive Predicate in the Definite Present or the Definite Imperfect, they are *infix*ed between the root of the Predicate and the Tense-sign. In all other Tenses they are suffixed to the Tense-sign, so as to stand between it and the Copula—

Root of Pred. Dir. O. Tense-sign. Cop. Subj.

D. Pr. Lel - ko - tan - a - le—Pronounce *lelketanale*,—we are seeing them.

D. Imp. Lel - ko - tantaeken - a - le „ *lelketan-taekenale*,—we were seeing them at that very moment.

R. of Pr. T. S. D. O. C. S.

Past. Lel - ked' - ko - a - le—Pronounce *lelked'koale*,—we saw them.

Perf. Lel - akad' - ko - a - le „ *lelakad'koale*,—we have seen them.

3rd.—When they stand as *Indirect Object* to a Predicate, they are preceded by *a*, meaning *to*, *for*, *against*, and, together with this Prefix, inserted according to the rule just given under 2—

Dir. O. Subj. R. O. Pr. Ind. Obj. Tense S. Cop.

Def. Pres. Baba -ing om - ako - tan - a,—I am giving them unhusked rice.

Bulung-ing om - ako - tantaeken-a,—I was then giving them salt rice.

REMARK.—In some Past Tenses Indirect Objects are not preceded by *a*, whereas in others elisions take place, which will be explained in the Chapter on the Past Tenses.

The Pronouns *ing*, *me*, and *i* undergo some phonetic changes in certain positions—

1st.—*Ing* used as *Subject* suffixed to a word ending in *e* forms with this vowel a kind of diphthong in which the *e*-sound predominates strongly, whereas the *i* is hardly heard. At times the *i* appears to be entirely dropped.

Ranchire^{ing} lelked'koa,—I saw them in Ranchi. Pi^{it}teng kultad'koa,—I sent them to the market.

Ing standing as infixed Subject (see above, Rem. 3) changes the *ng* into *ñ* before *a*. In this case the *i* of *ing* takes the jerk denoted by ('), and the preceding *e* of *re* or *te* is no longer heard.

Orátí^ñna,—I am going home. Ranchirí^ñna,—I stay or I am in Ranchi.

The same change of *ng* into *ñ* takes place whenever *ing* stands as infixed Direct or Indirect Object before *a*—

Ráin^ñako,—they will call me. Oteko omai^ñna,—they will give me land.

2nd.—*Me* standing as *Subject* of a proposition always drops the vowel *e* except in the three cases given below :—

Pred.	Cop. S.
Hasutan	-a. m,—thou art sick.

When the Pronominal Subject *m* is suffixed to a word ending in a consonant, a short euphonic *e* is inserted between that consonant and the suffix *m*—

Ne loiong-*ẽ*-m kiringa chi ?—Wilt thou buy this rice-field?

Me standing as *Subject* keeps the vowel *e*—

(1) When it is suffixed to the Copula *tan* in substantive propositions—

Munda tan-*me*,—thou art the village-chief.

(2) When it is suffixed to the words *mená*; to exist, to be present, and *banó*, to be absent, not to exist—

Menámeachi?—Art thou present?

N.B.—The form *menáma* is, however, also used.

(3) In the Second Person Singular of the Imperative Mood—

Hijúme! Come thou! *Senóme!* Go away!

N.B.—In two cases, however, the Imperative drops the *e* rather more frequently than not, viz.—

(a) When *ko*, they, stands as Direct or Indirect Object between the Predicate and the Pronoun—*Rá-ko-m*,—call them. *Om-ako-m*,—give it to them.

(b) When the Particles *kó* and *le* are inserted to form what may be called the Polite Imperative—*Hijúkóm!* Do come, please! *senlem!* go, please.

Here, however, *me* is oftener kept after *kó*. Thus *hijúkóme* occurs more frequently than *hijúkóm*.

Me very seldom drops the vowel *e* when it stands as infixed Direct Object. As Indirect Object it appears more frequently without the final *e*, especially in the Definite Present—

Om-am-tanae instead of *omametanae*,—he gives it to thee.

Kisi-am-tanae instead of *kisiametanae*,—he is angry with thee.

3rd.—The Pronoun *i*, *he* or *she*, preserves its original form only when it is suffixed as Subject to the Copula *tan*—

Uraon tan',—he is an Uraon.

When it stands as infixed *Direct Object*, it drops the peculiar jerk denoted by the mark (')—

Rá-i-me,—Call him.

When it stands as *Indirect Object*, it likewise drops the jerk, but it still preserves the *i* sound rather strongly, so that it cannot be said to form a diphthong with the preceding *a*—

Om-ai-me,—give it to him.

The same remark holds good with regard to *i* suffixed as *Subject* to the words *mená* and *banó*. Thus—

Menáia,—he is here. *Bangáia*,—he is not here.

In all other cases the Pronoun *i* is softened down into *e*: hence—

(1) Suffixed as Subject to words ending in *e*, it is hardly perceived except for the fact that it lengthens the preceding *e* slightly.

N.B.—In these cases the spelling *ee* is adopted instead of *i*. Thus: *Orátee nirjana*—Pronounce *orátee*,—he ran home.

(2) Suffixed to words ending in *a*, it forms with this vowel a diphthong, pronounced like *ai* in the English word *aisle*—

Senójanae,—he went away. *Kae hijúlena*,—he did not come.

(3) Suffixed to words ending in *i*, *o* or a consonant, it is pronounced as a short *ě*—

Gurūgudiriš lelnamtada, *Enad'dož halangkeda*,—he saw on the ground a curry-stone. Then he picked it up.

Sadom-ě lelkie,—he saw the horse.

2.—Emphatic Personal Pronouns.

Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
1st Pers., <i>aing</i> , I.	{ Includ. <i>alang</i> , thou and I. Exclus. <i>aling</i> , he and I or she and I.	{ <i>abu</i> , you and I. <i>ale</i> , they and I.
2nd Pers., <i>am</i> , thou.	<i>aben</i> , you two.	<i>ape</i> , you.
3rd Pers., <i>aé</i> , he or she.	<i>aking</i> , both, the two.	<i>ako</i> , they.

In some tracts the simple form *ing* is used also emphatically instead of *aing*.

These compounds always occupy an independent place in the proposition: they are never suffixed to another word.

They are used—

1st.—*As Subject* of a proposition whenever it is desired to lay a certain stress on the Pronominal Subject. These emphatic Pronominal Subjects stand before the Predicate, though not always immediately.

To the question *Senam-chi?*—Wilt thou go?, the Munda answers *Senaing*,—I'll go.

To the question *Okoi senae?*—Who will go?, the answer will be *Aing sena*,—I will go.

Dolabu Ranchite! Come, let's go to Ranchi! *Ape seno-pe aing taina nerege*,—Go you to Ranchi: as for me I shall remain here.

2nd.—Whenever it is required to specify or modify Personal Pronouns by means of a Suffix, as, *v. gr.*, in the phrases: of me or my, *aiñ-á*; towards me, *aing-tá*; for me, *aing-mente*; on thee, *am-re*; with them, *ako-ló*, etc.

REMARK.—The enclitics *ge*, *do*, *dang* or *derang* are very often suffixed to these emphatic subjects for the sake of stronger emphasis.

1. *Ge* is used to emphatically distinguish the subject from some other person. Hence *aingge*, *amge*, *aege*, etc., are best rendered into English by *I myself*, *thou thyself*, *he himself*, etc. It may therefore be called a corrective enclitic.

N.B.—It would be a mistake to consider the forms *aingge*, *amge*, etc., as Reflexive Pronouns. There are no such Pronouns in Mundari. That deficiency is amply compensated by the *Reflexive Voice* of Transitive Predicates—

Aége bagranlá—*He himself (and nobody else)* has spoiled it.

2. *Do* suffixed to Pronominal Subjects is likewise a corrective enclitic, but it affects the whole proposition.

It may be asked—Are not the Emphatic or independent forms *aing*, *am*, etc., the original Personal Pronouns? If so, the Suffix and Infix forms, which on page 12. I call Simple Personal Pronouns, should have to be considered as results of phonetic decay. Moreover, *me* and *i* should, in the scheme given above, be replaced by *m* and *e*. This view has in fact been adopted by the existing Mundari grammars as well as by Skrefsrud in his Santhal Grammar. He gives the Singular forms thus: *n'* (*ng*), *I*; *m*, *thou*; *e*, *he* or *she*, and says:—"When the words to which these suffixes are annexed terminate in a consonant, the full form is used in the first person singular and an *e* is either prefixed or affixed to the second person singular."

The following reasons show, I think, conclusively that *ing*, *me*, *i*, etc., are the original and complete Personal Pronouns, whereas the forms *aing*, *am*, *ae*, etc., are compound words:—

1st.—A suffix *ng* for *ing* or *aing* cannot be said to exist in Mundari, for even after words ending in a vowel the *i* is always heard except in the one case mentioned on page 14. Thus *Ka-ing sena*,—I will not go; *entedoing sena*,—then I shall go; *gungu-ing kiringa*,—I shall buy a leaf-umbrella.

2nd.—The so-called suffix *m* occurs only as *Subjective* suffix after words ending in a vowel, *v. gr.*, *létana-m*,—thou seest it. The statement that after words ending in a consonant an *e* is placed *either* before *or* after the *m* is, to say the least, misleading. The insertion of an *e* before the *m* is regulated by a definite law: it is only when *m* stands as suffixed *Subject* that an *e* is inserted *before* the *m*,—*never* after it. Thus *Sar-e-m kiringa chi?*—Wilt thou buy an arrow? *never* *Sar-me kiringa*? Nor can it be said that this is owing to the fact that the Subjective Suffix is the last syllable of a compound word, and therefore prefers the sound *em* to the sound *me*; for in the Imperfect Tenses the Pronominal Subject is generally infixed into the Predicate. In this position too the *e* must precede the *m*. Thus

Leltan-*e*-m-taikena,—thou wast looking on ; *never* leltan-*me*-taikena. Hence this *e* is evidently merely euphonic.

Whenever this Pronoun is infixed as Direct Object into the Predicate, the form *me* must be used after consonants, and is generally used even after vowels : thus Ter-*me*-aing,—I shall throw a stone at thee ; tam-*me*-aing,—I will strike thee ; rá-*me*-aing,—I shall call thee.

Again, *me* and not *em* is used whenever this Pronoun stands as Possessive Suffix to Nouns ending in a consonant—Hon-*me*-koṛa,—thy son. Now, if the *e* of *me* in these cases were merely euphonic, we should rather expect to see it before the *m* ; for ter-*em*-aing, tam-*em*-aing, hon-*em*-koṛa would be more easily pronounced than ter-*me*-aing, tam-*me*-aing, hon-*me*-koṛa. Hence it may be admitted that this *e* is not euphonic, but belongs to the root of the Pronoun.

3rd.—If the original Pronoun of the third person singular were really *ae*, the would-be truncated or suffix-form would indeed be *e*. But in that case how explain the rise of *e* to *i* in, *v. gr.*, tan-*i*, he is ; mená-*i*-a, he exists ; bangá-*i*-a,—he is not here ; Ranchir-*i*-a,—he is in Ranchi ; Ranchit-*i*-a,—he will go to Ranchi, as well as in all cases where the Third Person Singular is inserted into the Predicate as Direct or Indirect Object, *v. gr.*, lel-*i*-am,—thou wilt see him ; om-*ai*-aing,—I will give it to him. The slight traces of the law of harmony of vowels, still existing in Mundari, can, in none of these cases, be said to require this rise of *e* to *i*. The ordinary laws of euphony would, in most of these cases, rather make us expect a lowering from *i* to *e*. Original strong vowels readily sink down to weaker ones, but original weak vowels never rise to stronger ones, except in obedience to the law of harmony of vowels in most Agglutinative languages. But that law cannot be invoked in the present case. Hence *i* must be considered as the original Pronoun of the Third Person Singular. The *e* of *ae* may be considered as a weakening of this original *i*.

4th.—The practice of inserting Personal Pronouns as Direct or Indirect Objects into predicates naturally necessitates a great and constant care to protect these inserted Pronouns against any phonetic decay ; for if they are to perform that function in such a position, they must be readily recognized by the mind as really complete Pronouns. But if they be not protected against phonetic decay by a continuous and, so to say, conscious effort, they would, in a very short time, be ground down by the preceding and following syllables of that word which they, as it were, cut into two pieces, in a manner which

to any but Khol minds appears as very arbitrary and harsh. Since then the Khols have so pertinaciously clung to the practice of having Pronominal Objects infixed into their Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, it is natural that they should have preserved the pure original form of their Pronouns in that particular position more carefully than in any other. Hence it is in these infixed Pronominal Objects that we may expect to find the original forms. But, as already stated, the forms *ing*, *me*, and *i* are always used as infixed Direct or Indirect Objects, and they are so used even in cases where both the ordinary euphonic laws as well as the law of harmony of vowels would otherwise require either an elision or a weakening of *i* into *e*.

The Emphatic Pronouns *aing*, *am*, *de*, etc., are, I think, compounds of the Impersonal Pronoun *á* and the Personal Pronouns *ing*, *me*, *i*, etc. It will be shown lower down that the Impersonal Pronoun *á* may, like any Mundari word, be verbalized, *i.e.*, used as an Intransitive Predicate, and that with this function it is equivalent to the English verb *to be* (the Latin *esse*) in its copulative meaning. In the compounds *a-ing a-m á-e* it is used with this function, and means *it is*. Hence these compounds are curious counterparts of the English, French, and German emphatic phrases: *It is me*, *c'est moi*, *Ich bin es*.

The explanation and analysis of Personal and Impersonal Pronouns is, as a rule, not more easy in the Agglutinative than in the Flexional languages. The reason of this difficulty seems to lie in the fact that even the nomadic tribes, though ever ready to throw out old words and replace them by new ones, stick to the more common and original words, such as Pronouns and Numerals, almost as much as the Aryan races. Hence we may expect to find in these forms strong elisions and signs of phonetic decay, and sometimes we may be obliged to look for the explanation of some forms in other Agglutinative languages which have apparently no connection whatever with the one we may be studying at the time. If a Pronoun of an Indian aboriginal language finds no counterpart except in Chinese, Japanese, or even in some Siberian languages, this ought to be pointed out; for in the present imperfect knowledge of Agglutinative languages, it is impossible to decide whether such a counterpart be a proof that the two tribes have both kept the same root as an inheritance from a formerly common stock, or whether one tribe borrowed it from the other at a remote date when they may have been encamped for a time side by side, or whether it be a mere coincidence, if mere coincidences be at all admissible in languages.

Impersonal and Personal Pronouns of the Third Person Singular.

If we may suppose that language in its genesis follows consciousness itself, then it should be admitted that the Impersonal and Personal Pronouns of the Third Person are perhaps the most original and therefore the simplest forms. For self-consciousness implies the consciousness of something distinct from self as a necessary and prior element: the Ego or self is primarily perceived as opposed to the Non-Ego, *i.e.*, something out of and distinct from self. The first aspect under which the Non-Ego presents itself to consciousness is that of *some-thingness* or *bare being* in its vaguest sense. But this, in language, is denoted by the Impersonal Pronoun. As thus conceived, this Non-Ego implies neither number nor life. The Non-Ego, as perceived in a living entity, is already much more precise. It implies number, inasmuch as the mind naturally conceives a living Non-Ego as an *individuality*, a concept it transfers from the Ego to the *living Non-Ego*.

In Mundari we find the vowels *a* and *i* used to denote these two most elementary concepts. The vowel, with the highest pitch, *viz.*, *i*, is used to designate in general the *living Non-Ego*, which must needs strike the mind more forcibly.

The sharp sound marked by (') in *á* and *í* may possibly point to an original repetition of the simple sounds *a* and *i* for the purpose of emphatically pointing out the objects.

It is certainly a very peculiar fact that the Impersonal Pronoun *á* has no corresponding Dual and Plural forms. The direct consequence of this is the fact that even Nouns and other Pronouns denoting inanimate objects have no Dual and Plural.

An additional reason for considering the Personal Pronoun *i* as a very original form seems to lie in the fact that this Pronoun does not connote Gender. No more do its corresponding Dual and Plural forms. In those languages in which the Impersonal and Personal Pronouns of the Third Person imply both Number and Gender, these pronominal forms can hardly be considered as simple and original forms; for the idea of Gender especially could scarcely have been superadded to the original vague concept without the addition of a second Demonstrative to the original root, unless we suppose that one of originally synonymous roots was gradually set apart for this distinct function.

As a signifying agent the *Impersonal* Pronoun is the vaguest of words. The *Personal* Pronoun of the 3rd Person Singular is a great

deal more precise, inasmuch as it always points out one particular Non-Ego and represents it as *a living individual*.

N.B.—In Yakuti *a* occurs as Pronominal Suffix to Verbs. Boehtlingk in the Yakuti Grammar gives *a* as the Predicative affix to the 3rd Person Singular. But he says that this is referable to *ta* which is the Suffix of the 3rd Person Singular after simple vowels and heavy diphthongs.

The same author gives *a* as a lifeless Suffix (*erstarrtes affix*) in certain words, v.gr., *igiss*, to press against each other (intransitive) *ikiss-a*, that which is close by. *Cfr.* the Mundari *nanre* near *nanre-a*, that which is near.

Castren gives *a* as the real Dative Suffix in Burjatic. In Mundari *a* is a real Dative Prefix. It can, I think, be conclusively shown that this Mundari Prefix is nothing but the Impersonal Pronoun *a* with a transferred function.

In Otaïti *a* and *e* denote existence. In Malay the same idea is rendered by *ada*.

The Personal Pronoun of the Third Person Plural.

Compared with the Singular *i* the Plural form *ko*, *they*, is comparatively vague; for it simply designates a collection of living beings without specifying either the number of the collection or particularly pointing to one of the individuals of the collection. It directly means no more than the expressions—*More than one, a certain number, some*. It is therefore, functionally speaking, simply an *Indefinite Demonstrative*. Now in Mundari one of the ordinary Indefinite Demonstratives is *oko*. This denotes both one or more beings, whether living or inanimate. The initial *o* of *oko* is always very short—a mere set on as it were to the root *ko*. The Plural Pronoun *ko*, corresponding to the Singular *i* seems to be but this Indefinite Demonstrative root *ko*. If so, the Plural of Nouns, v.gr., *Horō-ko*, *kula-ko* would literally mean *man several, tiger-several, i.e., some men, some tigers*.

N.B.—*Ko* is one of the Plural suffixes in Chinese.

The Pronoun of the First Person Singular.

Since self-consciousness arises originally out of an antithesis of the Non-Ego to Self, and therefore implies the Non-Ego as a prior element, we may naturally expect the Pronoun of the 1st Person Singular to be a compound word containing in some way the Personal Pronoun of the 3rd Person Singular as one of its constituent elements. For if in its genesis language tends to follow consciousness, it would appear natural that the mind in framing a word to denote *Self* should have recourse to a method where the Non-Ego is already expressed, and thus signify Self by means of a word containing that very antithesis of the Non-Ego to the Ego which is contained in the original concept of Self. To obtain such an antithesis in words, the creation of a word exclusively

denotative of Self is not necessary. In fact, the formation of such a root seems as impossible as the formation of an original concept exclusively representative of *Self*. All that is required is that in the compound to be formed, the Ego be signified in some way by *implication*. May it not be conjectured that the Mundari Pronoun *ing*, *I*, has been obtained in this manner? Let us suppose this form to be a compound of *i*, *he* or *she* plus *ne*, *this* or *here*, and *ge*, another original Demonstrative emphatically pointing to something near. In that case the *i* would point out Self as a *living being*, and the use of two Demonstratives, both serving to specify as precisely as possible that particular living being, would sufficiently *imply* the speaker or the Ego himself. Thus the compound *i-ne-ge* would contain the required antithesis. That this should rapidly be contracted into *ing* is obvious in the case of a compound so constantly required. It is to be remarked that *ing* in its sharp pronunciation preserves as much as possible the sound denoted by ('). So far as functional precision is concerned, the Pronoun of the 1st Person is of all Demonstratives the most precise. Now the accumulation of Demonstratives indicated above, where each successive root specifies and narrows down the preceding one would appear eminently calculated to fit the compound *ing* for the very precise function it has to perform.

Personal Pronouns of the First Person Plural (exclusive form).

The existence of distinct Exclusive and Inclusive Dual and Plural forms of the 1st Person is met with in a certain number of languages, such as Manchu, Yakuti, certain Polynesian and American languages.

With regard to precision, the Inclusive form *le* is more precise than the Plural of the 3rd Person *ko*; for it does not simply denote a collection, but it specifies that collection, inasmuch as it indicates one individual of it, viz., the speaker, and it does in a way point out the other individuals as then and there standing in a particular relation to the speaker. It means, in fact, *I and those with me*. Now in Mundari the Postposition *lô* means *with, together with, along with*. Hence the root of which *lô* is either the ground form or more likely a modification, is a Demonstrative which in Mundari has *de facto* been used for the particular purpose of denoting a connection between or an association of individuals as well as contemporaneousness of events.

May not the Plural *le* (*we*, i.e., *they and I*) be considered as a particular form or even the original form of the root to which *lô* is to

be referred. If so, it would answer the special meaning inherent in the Exclusive Plural form by designating a collection of individuals *as connected with the speaker*. The connection would be sufficiently designated *as referring to the speaker* by the fact of his using the form; and this would dispense with the use of the Singular *ing*, *i.e.*, render superfluous the formation of a compound word in which the 1st Person Singular enters as an element.

Inclusive Plural form of the First Person.

None of the Mundari Demonstratives seems to throw any light on the Inclusive form *bu*,—*you and I*.

Boehtlingk gives *bu* as a Yakuti Demonstrative, denoting *immediate vicinity*. It occurs only, he says, in the Casus Indefinitus. In other Cases as well as in derivations the ground-forms are *ba* and *man*. In Manchu the Inclusive Plural form is *be*, *you and I*. In Sonthali it is either *bo* or *bon* (compare this with *man*). This is evidently but a weakening of *ba* which Boehtlingk identifies with *bu*. That a Demonstrative denoting *immediate vicinity* should be used by the speaker to designate both himself and those whom he addresses (*i.e.*, those around him), and should thus come to mean *you and I* appears natural enough.

Pronouns of the Second Person.

The same Demonstrative occurs as Personal Pronoun of the Second Person Singular in Mundari (*me*), in Cambodian *mé*, in Anamese *may*, and in Mon *m'neh*. Originally this, like the current Mundari Demonstrative *ne*, must have merely signified proximity. *Cfr.*, *man*=*ba*, which are given by Boehtlingk as ground-forms of *bu*, still denoting immediate proximity in Yakuti.

The dual *ben*, *you two*, may perhaps be accounted for as follows: The consonants *m* and *b* are interchangeable, *m* being a weakening of *b*: hence *me*, *thou*, may be considered as a weak form of *be* or *me*=*be*. If the Demonstrative *n* (*en*, *that*) be added to *be*, we would obtain *ben*, literally meaning *thou, that (one)*, *i.e.*, *you two*. Yakuti, Turkic, and even Sanscrit Plural forms of Pronouns seem to have been obtained by similar additions of Demonstratives which are synonymous or almost identical in meaning.

In *Mon*, which has several striking verbal resemblances with Mundari, the Plural of the Second Person is *pay*. This is evidently the same root as the Mundari Pronoun *pe*, *you*. *Pi*, which is mentioned by Edkins as an old Chinese Demonstrative meaning *this* and *he*, may perhaps be referred to the same root as the Mundari *pe* and the *Mon pay*.

If *me*, *thou*, *ben*, *you two*, and *pe*, *you*, be really only different modulations of one and the same root, then this would be an instance of a change of meaning attaching to a *consonantal* change in an Agglutinative language.

Inclusive and Exclusive Dual forms of the First Person.

The forms *lang*,—*thou and I*, and *ling*,—*he or she and I*, have arisen after the Plural forms, and from their very nature must be compound words.

The Mundas have a very peculiar idiom which may perhaps throw some light on the composition of *lang* and *ling*. At the same time it appears to confirm the conjecture given above concerning the real nature of the Plural *le*,—*they and I*.

The expression *Paku and I* has no literal equivalent in Mundari. The Mundas do not say *Paku oró aing*, but they say either *Aling Pakuló* or *Pakuló aing*.

Pakutaking means *Paku and his companion*. Now the expression *Paku, his companion, and I* stands in Mundari thus: *Ale Pakutakingló* or *Pakutakingló ale*.

At first sight a foreigner would think that in the expression *Aling Pakuló* or *Pakuló aing*, there is question of *three* individuals; for it literally means *we two together with Paku*. And in the expression *Ale Pakutakingló* or *Pakutakingló ale* there seems to be question of at least *five* individuals; for it literally means *we (i.e., they and I) together with Paku and his companion*. However, in the Munda's mind each of these phrases is a double or compound phrase: the first part enunciates the *total*, whereas the second part enumerates the *individuals* which make up that total. It is as though it were written and translated thus:—

Aling, Pakuló,—We two viz. (I) with Paku.

Ale, Pakutakingló,—We, viz. (I) with Paku and his companion.

Remark that in the second part the Pronoun *I* (*ing*) is not expressed, although one of the individuals enumerated in that part be the First Person. Besides the Postposition *ló*, *together with*, requires the mention, either explicitly or implicitly, of the First Person as *the* one who is *together with* Paku. The reason of this omission of an explicit Pronoun of the First Person can only be this—that the Munda considers the First Person as already named in the *idioma* either explicitly or by implication. Now it would appear that in the phrase *Aling Pakuló* the first person is named *explicitly*, whereas in *Ale Pakutakingló* it is mentioned only *implicitly*. That *ale* in this phrase connotes the first person is evident from the meaning of the phrase. That the connotation is made exclusively by *implication* is clear from the fact that no trace of the Pronoun *ing* is to be met with in *ale*. Nor is there any reason to think that *le* is the result of much phonetic decay. So far, then, this *idioma* confirms the conjecture that *le* denotes a collection of individuals in which the First Person is *connoted* by the fact of its being used by the speaker.

That the First Person is signified explicitly in *Aling Pakuló* seems evident from the actual meaning of the Exclusive Dual, which is —*He* and *I* as well as from the very form *aling*, in which *ng* corresponds to the consonants *ng* in *ing*.

Presupposing the Plurals *le* and *ale* as having existed before the Duals, let us see how the Mundas would have applied the above *idioma* to the expression “he and I,” corresponding to “Paku and I.” They would naturally place the Plural *ale* first to denote the total, and then enumerate the individuals, viz., *i* and *ing*, and thus obtain *ale-i-ing*, which would at once contract into *aling*, i.e., *we*, viz., *he and I*.

In this hypothesis *ló* does not enter as a factor into the Dual *aling*. We may suppose too that by means of *ló* the form *aling* was obtained—thus, *Aé-ló-ing*; literally, *with him I*. In this hypothesis the form *ling* would really be a truncated form of *aling*.

The same *idioma* applied to the expression *thou and I* would stand thus: *Ale, am, ing*, *we*, viz., *thou and I*. The elision of *e* before *a*, the throwing out of the consonant *m*, and the elision of *i* would yield *alang*, meaning literally *We*, viz., *thou and I*. It is difficult to suppose that *alang* should have been obtained from *amlóing*, *thou with me*. Hence, by analogy, it is more probable too that *aling* is really obtained by the juxtaposition *ale i ing* than from *aé-ló-ing*.

Whatever may have been the actual process, the forms *aling* and *ling* contain parts of the Pronouns *ale* or *le*, *i*, and *ing*, and the forms *alang* and *lang* contain parts of *ale* or *le*, *am*, and *ing*.

III.—DEFINITE, INDEFINITE AND INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

1.—Definite Demonstrative Pronouns.

The Definite Demonstrative Pronouns are formed by suffixing the Simple Personal Pronoun of the Third Person *i*, *king*, *ko* to the Definite Demonstrative Adjectives *ne*, *en* (*hen*), and *han*, when the Demonstrative Pronouns denote living beings. The Impersonal Pronoun *a* is suffixed when the Demonstrative Pronouns denote inanimate objects.

REMARK.—In the formation of these Pronouns some slight phonetic changes take place :

1. In *ne-i* this one (literally, this he or this she) the *e* elides with *i*; hence the form *ni*.
2. In all the compounds, in which the vowels *e* and *i* are not in immediate contact, the vowel *i*, influencing the weaker vowel *e*, raises it into *i*; hence the forms *niking* instead of *neking* these two (literally, this the two); *in* instead of *en-i* that one (literally, that he or that she); *inking* instead of *en-king*, those two (literally, that the two).
3. The vowel *i* thus produced in the Singular *in* and in the Duals *niking* and *inking* is, by a false analogy, very frequently kept in the Plural. But then it reacts on the *o* of the Plural Suffix *ko* and transforms it into *u* to harmonize it with *i*. Hence the forms *inku* instead of *en-ko*, which would be the regular Plural, those ones; *niku* instead of *ne-ko*, these ones.

However, the regular form *enko* occurs also.

The *i* of *ni* is always kept in the Plural. But it does not always influence the final *e* because it is itself already weakened by its position after the consonant *n*. Hence the form *niko* is heard, though it be not as frequent as *niku*.

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
L. bgs.	<i>ni</i> , this one.	<i>niking</i> , these two.	<i>niko</i> and <i>niku</i> , these ones.
L. o.	<i>ned</i> , this one.	<i>ned</i> , these two.	<i>ned</i> , those ones.
L. bgs.	<i>in</i> , that one.	<i>inking</i> , those two.	<i>inku</i> or <i>enko</i> , those.
L. o.	<i>end</i> , that one.	<i>end</i> , those two.	<i>end</i> , those.
L. bgs.	<i>han</i> , yonder one.	<i>hanking</i> , yonder two.	<i>hanko</i> , yonder ones.
L. o.	<i>hand</i> , yonder one.	<i>hand</i> , yonder two.	<i>hand</i> , yonder ones.

N. B.—The strong form *hen* instead of *in* never undergoes any change. Hence the Dual *henking* and the Plural *henko*.

REMARK.—The *i*, *o*. forms *nea*, *ena* (*hena*) and *hana* are, in some parts, frequently used as Adjectives instead of *ne*, *en* (*hen*), *han*. Thus *Nea* *daru* instead of *ne* *daru*, this tree. *Hana* *buru* instead of *han* *buru*, yonder mountain.

The word *leka*, like, with the Personal Pronominal Suffixes *i*, *king*, *ko*, or with the Demonstrative Suffixes *ni*, *niking*, *niko*, may be suffixed either to the Singular or the Dual or the Plural of the Definite Demonstrative Pronouns to form Qualificative Demonstrative Pronouns: hence three double sets of such Pronouns are obtained, viz., one where the forms *lekai* (*lekant*), *lekaking* (*lekanking*), *lekako* (*lekanko*) are suffixed to the Singulars *ni*, *in*, *han*; another where those forms are suffixed to the Duals *niking*, *inking*, *hankina*; and a third where the same form are suffixed to the Plurals *niko*, *inku*, *hanko*.

REMARK.—In the Dual and Plural Suffixes *lekaniking* and *lekaniko* the *i* of *ni* is dropped. Hence the forms *nilekaniking*, *nilekanko*, etc., etc. The Impersonal *nea-leka-ena*, likewise drops the *e* after *a*. Hence the forms: *nealekaná*, *enalekaná*, etc.—

SINGULAR.			DUAL.			PLURAL.		
L. b.	<i>nilekád</i> or <i>nilekaní</i>	} one like this one.	<i>nilekaking</i> or <i>nilekanking</i>	} two like this one.	<i>nilekako</i> or <i>nilekanko</i>	} some, several like this one.		
I. o.	<i>nealekád</i> or <i>nealekaná</i>	} one like this one.	<i>nealekád</i> or <i>nealekaná</i>	} two like this one.	<i>nealekád</i> or <i>nealekaná</i>	} some, several like this one.		
L. b.	<i>inilekád</i> or <i>inilekaní</i>	} one like that one.	<i>inilekaking</i> or <i>inilekanking</i>	} two like that one.	<i>inilekako</i> or <i>inilekanko</i>	} some, several like that one.		
I. o.	<i>enalekád</i> or <i>enalekana</i>	} one like that one.	<i>enalekád</i> or <i>enalekaná</i>	} two like that one.	<i>enalekád</i> or <i>enalekaná</i>	} some, several like that one.		
L. b.	<i>hanílekde</i> or <i>hanílekani</i>	} one like yonder one.	<i>hanílekaking</i> or <i>hanílekanking</i>	} two like yonder one.	<i>hanílekako</i> or <i>hanílekanko</i>	} some, several like yonder one.		
I. o.	<i>hanalekád</i> or <i>hanalekaná</i>	} one like yonder one.	<i>hanalekád</i> or <i>hanalekaná</i>	} two like yonder one.	<i>hanalekád</i> or <i>hanalekaná</i>	} some, several like yonder one.		

The second double set is obtained by adding the Compound Suffixes to Duals—*niking*, *inking*, *hanking*. Here the Impersonal forms do not exist—

<i>Nikinglekád</i> or <i>Nikinglekani</i>	} one like these two.	<i>Nikinglekaking</i> or <i>Nikinglekanking</i>	} two like these two.	<i>Nikinglekako</i> or <i>Nikinglekanko</i>	} some like these two.
---	-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	---	---------------------------------

Etc.

The third double set is obtained by adding the same Suffixes to the Plurals—*niku* (*niko*), *inku*, *hanko*—

<i>Nikulekád</i> or <i>Nikulekani</i>	} one like these ones.	<i>Nikulekaking</i> or <i>Nikulekanking</i>	} two like these ones.	<i>Nikulekako</i> or <i>Nikulekanko</i>	} some, several like these ones.
---	------------------------------	---	------------------------------	---	--

The Compounds *lekde* (*lekani*), *lekád* (*lekana*) may in the same manner be suffixed to any Pronoun, Noun or Adjective, and thus produce as many double sets of Qualifying Demonstrative Pronouns as there are Nouns, Adjectives, and Pronouns in the language, thus:—*Amlekde* (*amlekani*), one like thee; *Amlekako* (*amlekanko*), men of thy stamp.

REMARK.—Circumstances or the context must show how the Compounds thus obtained should be rendered into English. Sometimes the English equivalent will closely resemble the Mundari word in its structure, *v. gr.*, *Ako lekani*, one like them. Sometimes it will be an Adjective, *v. gr.*, *Jontulekani*, a beastly man. At other times a whole English proposition will be required to give an intelligible rendering. The Tense of the Predicate, then, is decided by

the context or the circumstances, *v. gr.*, *Okoilekanko* taikera? Literally, which one like ones were there? *i.e.*, which one (of us or of you or of them) did those who were there resemble? If the Adjective to which the Compounds are suffixed are Participial ones, the Tense of the corresponding English Relative Clause is *ipso facto* indicated, *v. gr.*, Anterior Past: *Hasilenlekanko*,—Men who look as though they had been sick, or as though they had just passed through a sickness.

N.B.—These Compounds might of course be considered as Nouns. They are here classified as Pronouns because they are real Demonstratives, and in their formation follow the ordinary Demonstrative Pronouns.

2.—Indefinite Pronouns.

These are formed by suffixing either the Personal Pronoun *i* or the Demonstrative Pronoun *ni* to the Indefinite Adjectives *oko*, *ja*, *jeta*, *jan*, *jetan*, *etá*.

The Impersonal or Neuter forms are obtained by suffixing *á*.

The Personal Pronoun is suffixed to *oko*, *ja*, *jan*, *jeta*, *jetan*.

The Demonstrative Pronoun is suffixed to *oko* and *etá*.

REMARK.—1. *Etá* takes the Simple Suffixes *king* and *ko* for the Dual and Plural: hence the forms *etáking* and *etáko*.

2. *Ja* with a Pronominal Suffix always takes the Enclitic *ge* in the Singular.

3. The Suffix *i* is softened into *e* where it is preceded by a vowel. Hence the forms *okoe*, *jaege*, *jetae*.

4. In some districts the Impersonal *á* hardly keeps anything of the jerk denoted by (').

5. *á* is never suffixed to *ja*.

6. The Impersonal form of *etá* inserts a euphonic *g* between the two *ás*; the jerk denoted by (') falls away altogether from the *á* of *etá*. Hence the form *etágá*,—something else, another one.

SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
L.b. <i>okoe</i> ,—some one.	<i>okóking</i> ,—some two.	<i>okoko</i> ,—some.
L.o. <i>okód</i> ,—something.		
L.b. <i>okoni</i> ,—some ... some.	<i>jáking</i> ,—any two at all.	<i>jako</i> ,—any ones at all.
L.b. <i>jaege</i> ,—any one at all.	<i>jánking</i> ,—any two.	<i>janko</i> ,—any ones.
L.b. <i>jání</i> ,—any one.		
L.o. <i>jáná</i> ,—anything.	<i>jetáking</i> ,—some two.	<i>jetako</i> ,—some ones.
L.b. <i>jetae</i> ,—some one.		
L.o. <i>jetád</i> ,—something.	<i>jetánking</i> ,—some two.	<i>jetanko</i> ,—some ones.
L.b. <i>jetani</i> ,—some (any) one.		
L.o. <i>je:and</i> ,—some (any) thing.	<i>etáking</i> ,—two other ones.	<i>etáko</i> ,—other ones.
L.b. <i>etáni</i> ,—a ^r other one.		
L.o. <i>etágá</i> ,—another thing.		

Sometimes two different forms are used together.

Of the Dual and Plural forms given above, *etáking* and *etáko* are the only ones that are used regularly. The others are but seldom heard.

Instead of *okoko* the Reduplication *okoekoe* is generally used thus :
Chiko hijúlena? Have they come? *Okoeokoeko hijújana*,—Some
 have come.

N. B.—Ko in *okoekoesko* is not the Plural Suffix, but the Pronominal Subject to *hijújana*.

The Singular form *okoe* may perform a Plural function in Negative propositions. Then it generally takes the Suffix *o*, even, *v. gr.*, *Okoeo bangkoa*,—There is nobody here.

Okoni is chiefly used in disjunctive propositions. It may have a Plural meaning; the Predicate even in that case may stand in the Singular. *V. gr.*, some people can afford it, whereas others cannot afford it,—*Okoni dariae, okonido kae daria*.

The forms *jaege*, *jetae*, *jani*, *jetani* are generally used with a Plural function. In Negative propositions they generally take the Suffix *o* even—

Jaego ráaukom!—Call anybody at all. *Jetaeo bankoá*,—There is nobody at home.

REMARK.—Negative forms, such as, *v. gr.*, the Latin *nemo* do not exist in Mundari. The deficiency is supplied by *banó*,—not to be present, not to exist; or by the Negative Particle *ka*.

The Predicate *banó* may precede or follow the Indefinite Pronominal Subject. Thus *Jetaeo bangkoá* or *Bangkoá jetaeo*,—There is nobody here.

When these Pronouns stand as Subject to some other Predicate, the Negative Particle may be placed either after the Pronoun, followed by the Predicate, or the Pronoun may follow the Predicate. In this case *ka*, of course, stands before the Predicate—

Jetaeo kako hijújana or *Kako hijújana jetaeo*,—Nobody at all has come.
Jetaná ka wájana or *Ka wájana jetaná*,—Nothing at all has fallen.

Similarly, these Pronouns may precede or follow the Predicate when they stand as Direct or Indirect Objects. In this case care must be taken to insert *Plural Pronouns* into the Predicate as Repeated Direct or Indirect Objects corresponding to the *l. b.* forms *jaege*, *jetae*, etc.—

Kaing lelked'koa jetaeo or *jetaeo kaing lelked'koa*,—I saw nobody; *jaegeo kas boroakoa* or *kae boroakoa jaegeo*,—he is afraid of nobody in the world; *jetandó kaing lellá* or *kaing lellá jetandó*,—I saw nothing.

A certain number of Indefinite Adjectives perform the function of Indefinite Pronouns without taking any Pronominal Suffix. All of them may stand indiscriminately both for Nouns denoting living beings or for such as denote inanimate objects. With the exception of *miad'*, one, any, they all have a Plural meaning. But *miad'* too is construed as though it were a Plural—

Miad', one; *tara*, several; *taratara*, or *tatara*, or *taramara*, pretty many, pretty much; *purá*, many, much; *isupurá*, very many, very much; *huring* or *huringleka*, a few, a little; *huring huring* or *huduring*, very few, a very little; *huring huringleka* or *huduringleka*, very few or a very little; *kented'*, a great many, large numbers; plenty, heaps of; *mer mer*, immense numbers, no end of.

REMARK.—*Miad'* always takes the Suffix *o*, and is used only in Negative Propositions. The others generally take the Enclitic *ge*.

Miad'o bangkod,—There is not even a single one here. *Miad'o kaing lelked'koa* or *Kaing lelked'koa miad'o*,—I have not seen a single one. *Puráge menákoa*,—There are many present. *Huring huringge namtad'koaing*,—I got a very few only. *Mer mergeko hundiakana*,—Large crowds are gathered.

NOTE.—One of the chief functions of *leka* is the formation of Adverbs of Manner: hence *Huringleka*, etc., may be looked upon as Adverbs of Manner. All the other Adjectives enumerated above, excepting *miad'*, may, without taking any Adverbial Suffix, be used also as Adverbs of Manner.

3.—Definite Interrogative Pronouns.

The Definite Interrogative Pronouns are formed either by suffixing the *Definite Demonstrative Pronoun* to the Indefinite Adjective *oko* or by suffixing the *Personal* and *Impersonal Pronouns* to the Definite Adjectives, *chikan*, *chilekan*.

REMARK.—The Definite Demonstrative Suffix *ni* drops the *i* in the Dual and Plural. Hence the forms *okonking?* and *okonko?*

- L. b. *Okoni?* Which one? *Okonking?* Which two? *Okonko?* Which ones?
- I. o. *Okonea?* Which one?
- L. b. *Chikani?* What kind one? *Chikan-king?* Two of what kind? *Chikan-ko?* What kind ones?
- I. o. *Chikana?* What kind one?
- L. b. *Chilekani?* Which like one? *Literally*, one like which one? *Chilekan-king?* Which like two? *Literally*, two like which one? *Chilekanko?* Which like ones? *Literally*, some like which one?
- I. o. *Chilekana?* What like one?

Okonking menákinga? Which two are there? Soma Pakutaking, Soma and Paku. *Chikanko* hijúlenako—Uraon chi Horoko? What kind of people came—Uraons or Mundas? *Chilekanking* hende chi eselgeaking? What were the two like—black or fair?

The Compound Definite Demonstratives described on pages 27 and 28 may all be used as Definite Interrogative Pronouns.

4.—Indefinite Interrogative Pronouns.

The Indefinite Pronouns given in the preceding chapter may be used as Indefinite Interrogative Pronouns. What has been said there concerning the Dual and Plural forms as well as the Plural function of the Singular forms holds good also when those forms are used as Interrogative Pronouns.

Okoe? Who? frequently forms its Dual and Plural by inserting *te* or *ta* between the Singular form *okoe?* Who? and the Suffixes *king* and *ko*. Thus *okoetehing?* or *okoetaking?* Who (two)? *Okoeteko* or *okoetako?* Who?

N.B.—*Te* and *ta* are similarly inserted into the Dual and Plural of Proper Nouns. They thus denote either *relationship* or *intimacy* or mere *companionship*. Hence *Somataking* may mean *Soma* and either *his wife, brother, sister, or any other relation junior to him*; or it may mean *Soma* and *his friend*; or *Soma* and *his companion, i.e., the one who happens to be with him just now*.

This idiom implies at the same time that the person whose name is expressed is the superior or senior or in some respect the most conspicuous of the collection signified.

From what has just been said, it may be inferred how the forms *okoetaking*, *okoetako* differ also in meaning from the reduplications *okoe okoe?* or the rarely used simple Dual and Plural *okoking?* *Okoko?* Thus *okoetaking?* might freely be translated: Who with his relation, friend or companion? *Okoetako?* Who with his family or who with his friends, etc. What gang? or the like.

There are neither Relative nor Reflexive Pronouns in Mundari.

The deficiency of Relative Pronouns is compensated—

- (1) by Transitive and Intransitive Predicates being used as Participial Adjectives, *v.gr.*, *Hola hijúlen horo*; *literally*, the yesterday having come man, *i.e.*, the man *who* came yesterday;
- (2) by Nouns of Agency, obtained by suffixing the Personal Pronouns *i*, *king*, *ko* or the Demonstrative Pronoun *ni* to Participial Adjectives, *v. gr.*, *Hola hijúleni*,—The one *who* came yesterday;
- (3) by the use of Co-ordinate propositions where we would use a Relative Clause as subordinate to some Principal Clause,

or by means of an appropriate question and answer, *v. gr.*,
 Hola mid' hoꝛo Ranchiete hijúlenae ; iníge ju ráauime :
literally, a certain man came yesterday from Ranchi ; go
 and call that one here ; for, go and call the man *who* came
 yesterday from Ranchi. Or Hola mid' hoꝛo Ranchiete
 hijúlenae chi ka ? Ini'ge mar ju ráauime ? *Literally*,
 Didn't a certain man come yesterday from Ranchi ?
 Well, go and call that one here.

The Definite Demonstrative *okoni* and the Indefinite *okoe* are
sometimes used as Correlative Pronouns to the Demonstratives *né* or *iní*.
 In this construction *okoni* or *okoe* always stands First. *Okoe* kae boroa
inígee senóka,—Send some one (*literally*, let that one go) who is not
 afraid.

The deficiency of Reflexive Pronouns is compensated by the Reflexive
 Voice of Transitive Predicates, *v. gr.*, *Dal*, to strike ; *dalen*, to strike
 one's self.

No distinct roots exist for *Possessive Adjectives* or *Possessive Pronouns*.

The various ways in which this deficiency is compensated will be
 explained in the Chapter on the Equivalents of Declensions.

VI—POSTPOSITIONS.

These words correspond to our Prepositions; but since they are always suffixed to some other word, they are called Postpositions. Most, if not all of them, originally denote relations of space. The original meanings have been transferred to time as well as to other relations, which might be called moral relations, viz., such as are implied, *v. gr.*, in the propositions—He died *for* his country. He trusts *in* Providence.

There are very few original roots of this kind; but these, concurring with each other, yield a number of Compound Postpositions quite sufficient for the requirements of the language.

The functions of the Postpositions may be classed under four heads—

- (1) They perform all the functions of our Prepositions.
- (2) They replace the declensional and conjugational inflexions of Organic languages.
- (3) They are used to form Adverbs of manner, time, place, and number.
- (4) They take the place of the various Conjunctions, which, in Organic languages, introduce subordinate Final, Causal, Conditional, Temporal or other Circumstantial Clauses.

This function is one of the chief characteristics of the language. By its means our Subordinate Clauses are reduced to mere Qualifying Appositions to some part of the principal proposition. Thus our most complicated sentences can be rendered into Mundari by simple propositions, having but one Subject and one Predicate.

Detailed explanations of the second, third, and fourth set of functions performed by the Postpositions will be given in subsequent chapters.

The present chapter only sets down the various meanings of each Postposition, and points out the elements of Compound Postpositions—

Re (1) When used of space, generally denotes rest:
hence, when it is suffixed to Nouns or
Pronouns to denote mere spatial relations,
it must be rendered by *in, on, at.*

Hatu-re, in the village; *sakam-re*, on the leaf;
Ranchi-re, at Ranchi; *sadom-re*, on the horse; *orá-re*,
in the house, at home.

REMARK 1.—The beginner must guard against restricting the use of *re* to phrases where in English the Preposition *in* occurs. For the

Compound Postpositions *chetanre*, etc., *sirmare*, etc., are equivalent only to the English—*on the top of*, *on the summit of*, *on high*, *above*. Hence the English *on* is much more frequently to be rendered by *re* than by *chetanre*, etc.

REMARK 2.—*Re* is rather frequently used where we would expect a Postposition denoting motion towards or from (see remarks 1 and 2 under *Te* and remark 1 under *Ete*).

- (2) Transferred to time, *re* denotes both the past and the future.

Hence, suffixed to Nouns to denote the future,
it means *after*.

Suffixed to Nouns to denote the past, it means *before*, *ago*.

Chimtangem ruara? Api *mā-re*,—When wilt thou return?—*After* three days.

Chimtangem akiringkeda? Isu *sirma-re*,—When didst thou sell it?—Many years *ago*.

- (3) It is suffixed to Nouns denoting the price for which something is bought or sold, and
means *for*.

Ne lijá chimin *taka-re-m* kiringtada?—Bar *taka-re*,—*For* how many rupees did you buy this cloth?—*For* two rupees.

Tā.—The root *ta* denotes *permanence*, *continuation* both in space and time. This appears evident from the functions it performs (1) in the Copula *tan*, (2) in the Static Tenses in *ta* and *tad*, (3) in the Imperfect Tenses, and (4) in the Compound Postpositions.

If this *ta* be used intransitively, it will mean *to continue*, *to last*, *to remain*. If thus used, it will take the Copula *á*, *is* or *it is*. Hence *tad* means *it remains*, *it continues*.

The Postposition *tā* seems to be nothing else than this *tad* contracted.

Hence *tā* is already a Compound Postposition; in form and meaning a complete proposition, meaning *it continues*, *it remains*.

Now in Mundari there are no special forms or Suffixes to denote *correlation*. Hence the absolute or simple forms are used also with a correlative meaning. In propositions where words are used with a correlative meaning, there occur two Subjects, the second or correlative Predicate being understood. Thus, *iminung* means *that much*. The correlative sentence *I can lift up as much as thou canst* is literally rendered thus into Mundari: Thou that much I can lift,—*Am iminung-ing rimdaria*.

Thus, then, *iminung* means both *that much* and *as much as*. Similarly, *tá* means *it is* (permanently here or there) and *there where it is permanently*.

It is especially in its correlative meaning that *tá* concurs with *re, te, etc (ate)* to form the Compound Postpositions enumerated below. Thus, *daru táre* literally means, in there where the tree remains, *i.e., at the tree*. *Daru táte*, literally, to there where the tree remains, *i.e., to or towards the tree*.

1st.—As a separate Postposition, *tá* is chiefly used to point out the spot where an action is going on. It is suffixed to Transitive or Intransitive Participles, and means ... *... there... where.*

Daru má-tá menáia,—He is there where (they) cut the tree. Chenṛeko mendko-tá-e kamitana,—He works there where the birds are (kept).

2nd.—Suffixed to Nouns it denotes a more or less vague proximity, and means ... *... about, in the surroundings of around.*

Ranchi-tá, about Ranchi, around Ranchi.

Sá is an equivalent of *tá* and occurs about as frequently as *tá*.

Pd is another equivalent of **td**. In the Larka district it is used as Postposition instead of **td**. In the Upper Chota Nagpur parts it occurs only in a few Compounds.

Te—1st.—Suffixed to Nouns denoting *places*, such as *countries, towns, mountains, etc., etc.*, signifies *motion towards*, and means ... *to, unto*.

Calcutta-te-king senójana,—Both are gone *to Calcutta*.
Bir-te-ko nirlena,—They ran *to the forest*.

REMARK 1.—*Te* suffixed to those Nouns denotes the exact terminus of the motion towards. It is therefore not an equivalent of the English *into*. *Into*, though denoting motion, must be rendered by *re*: hence when the above Nouns stand as Indirect Objects to the Intransitive Predicates *bolo*, to enter; *dé*, to climb; *uiugó*, to fall, or their synonyms they take the Suffix *re*—

Gara-te argunjanae,—He went down *to the river*. But

Gara-re argunjanae,—He went down *into the river*.

Ord-te sonjanae,—He is gone *to the house or home*. But

Ord-re bolójanae,—He entered *into the house*.

Daru-re déjanae,—He climbed up *in among the branches of the tree*.

Sadom-re déjanae,—He mounted *a horse*.

N.B.—He climbed or ascended the mountain may be rendered both by *burn-te déjanae* and *buru-re déjanae*.

REMARK 2.—Similarly, Nouns denoting objects there and then considered as a *place* or *receptacle* take *re* and not *te* when they stand as Indirect Object to the Transitive Predicates *do*, to place; *uid*, to drop; *au* (*agu*), to bring, and their synonyms. Here, again, a real motion towards is rendered by *re*.—

Mej-re dotam! Put it *on the table*. *Kuan-re uidkom*,—Drop or let them fall *into the well*. *Pindigi-re aume*,—Bring it *into the verandah*.

2nd.—Suffixed to Nouns not primarily signifying places, it denotes—

(a) *Instrumentality* in the strict sense, and means *by, with, through, by means of, on, in*.

Ari-te-ko hadlá,—They cut it *with a saw*. *Sadom-te ling hijúlena*,—We came *on horseback*. *Kata-te senóme*,—Go *on foot*. *Reil-te-bu sena*,—We shall go *by rail*; we shall take the train.

Te—(concl'd.)

- (b) It denotes *the material* out of which something is made, and means ... *of, out of, from, with.*

Duar *daru-te*-ko baica,—They make doors *out of* timber.
Ne ora *inta-te* baiakana,—This house is built *with* bricks.

- (c) It denotes *the price* for which something is bought, sold or hired, and means ... *for.*

Mopre *sai taka-te*-ng kiringked/kinga,—I bought both of them *for* five hundred rupees.

3rd.—Suffixed to Nouns denoting feelings, passions or any subjective dispositions, it denotes—

- (a) *Cause*, and means ... *with, through, for, on account of.*

Kis-te rātanae,—He *cries through* rage. *Rasika-te* kaklatanae,—He shouts *for* joy. *Hasu-te* eklatanae,—He trembles *on account of* the pain.

- (b) *Manner*. The compounds thus obtained are generally to be rendered into English by *some Adverb of Manner,*
or by ... *Adverbial phrases.*

Rasika-te kamitanae,—He works *cheerfully, with* pleasure.

4th.—In some expressions the Mundas use *te* where we would use *in*, because the idea of instrumentality, in the wide sense of the word, really exists in those phrases—

Nutum-te, in the name of . . . *Umbul-te*: literally, with the shadow of, *i.e.*, in the name or with the authority of; as agent or attorney or plenipotentiary of . . . *Rup-te*, in or under the (assumed) appearance of.

NOTE.—*Te* appears to be but a weak form of *ta*. The change of form causing a change of meaning is not of uncommon occurrence. *Ta* denotes permanence, *te* motion. Similarly, *ka*, as a Tense-sign, denotes the present, whereas the weak form *ken* denotes the past.

Ló—Abstracts from the ideas of rest and motion.

It is used both of space and time—

1st.—In space it denotes accompaniment, connection, association: hence suffixed to Nouns or Pronouns depending on Predicates expressive of either *rest* or *motion*, it means ... *together with, with, along with.*

Aling-ló tainme,—Remain *with him and me.* *Niku-ló hijúlenae*,—He came *with these ones.*

2nd.—Transferred to time *ló* denotes simultaneity.

Thus it is suffixed to Participial forms, and yields equivalents of temporal clauses to be explained in a subsequent chapter.

NOTE.—*Le* is used as an Anterior Present and Future and Past Tense Suffix. This *le*, again, appears to be but a weak form of *ló*. If so, it is another instance of a change of meaning being brought about by a change of form. Here the strong form denotes simultaneity, whereas the weak form denotes priority.

A.—Inserted Indirect Pronominal Objects are preceded by a simple *a* in the Indeterminate Tense, the Future, the Definite Present, the Simple Past, all the corresponding Imperfect Tenses and in the Imperative Mood—

Pred. I. O. Cop. Subj.

Om . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I will give (it) *to* them.

Si . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I will plough *for* them.

Lel . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I will look *at* them; I'll keep an eye *on* them.

Bai . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I will arrange the matter *on behalf* of them.

Kisi . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I will get angry *with* them or *against* them.

Suku . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I will be pleased *with* them.

Boro . *a* . *ko* . *a* . ing,—I shall be afraid *of* them.

These examples show the various words by which the relations implied in the above Indirect Objects are rendered into English.

The greater number of such Indirect Objects depend on Predicates which denote a real transfer of something from one to another, such as *to give, to carry, to take to, to bring, to lend, to sell, etc., etc.*, and their synonyms. In these the relation primarily implied is one of *motion in space, i.e.*, motion from an agent to a recipient. But to this primary relation a new moral relation is superadded in most cases, *i.e.*, generally

the transfer of a *right* or the relation of *ownership* as transferred from one to another.

The relations implied in the above examples by *for*, *at*, *on behalf with*, *against*, and *of* can either be traced back to the one denoted by *to* or are so closely connected with it as to be easily derived from it. All of them are in fact real equivalents of the so-called Latin *Datives of advantage or disadvantage*. In *siakoaing* and *baiakoaing* it is the bestowing of a certain emolument or benefit on somebody, *i.e.*, a real transfer, just as in *omakoaing*. In *kisiakoaing* and *sukuakoaing* subjective feelings are considered as directed to some one else. *Boroakoaing* is a peculiar idiom indeed, inasmuch as it exhibits the feeling of fear as directed towards some one else. In all of them, therefore, the relation implied is a double one, containing two distinct elements, *viz.*, (1) a primary relation of space, a motion from one to another, (2) an additional relation, which abstracts from space, inasmuch as, over and above the material transfer, it implies something purely mental, *i.e.*, a *right* or a *disposition* as transferred from one to another. It is this second element which constitutes the prominent feature of that double relation. In most cases the element of space is much effaced; it remains as it were a mere, hardly perceptible substratum of what might be called a moral relation. But it is and remains a real substratum, and the moral or intellectual side of the expression is gained, *not by a new word ad hoc*, but by the *simple transfer of one and the same word from the material to the immaterial sphere, i.e., from space to mind*.

Now, is the relation which is, in the above examples, expressed by the English *to*, *for*, *at*, etc., signified explicitly by *a* in the Mundari construction, or is that relation merely implied, but not expressed in Mundari? In other words, should it be said that in the above examples *ako* must grammatically be cut up into two parts, *viz.*, (1) the Preposition *a* meaning *to*, *for*, *at*, etc., and (2) the Simple Pronoun *ko*, *they*? or may it be admitted that *ako* is simply one word, *viz.*, the long or Emphatic Personal Pronoun? In the latter supposition the rule concerning the Inserted Direct and Indirect Objects would run as follows:—

- (I)—In the case of *Direct Pronominal Objects*, the *Simple Personal Pronouns* are inserted into the Predicates. In the case of *Indirect Pronominal Objects* the long or *Emphatic Personal Pronouns* are inserted into the Predicate in the following Tenses: In the Indeterminate Tense, in the

Definite Present, etc.; etc. In the first supposition the rule would stand thus :

(II)—In the case of Direct Pronominal Objects *the Simple Pronouns* are inserted into the Predicate in all Tenses.

In the case of Indirect Pronominal Objects, the Simple Pronouns, inserted into the Predicate, are introduced by the Preposition *a* in the following Tenses: the Indeterminate Tense, etc., etc.

Now, the rule marked (I) appears to be a gratuitous assertion. For—

- (1) It leaves the Indirect Object forms without any intrinsic explanation.
- (2) No extrinsic or mere phonetic reason can be adduced either for the use of the Emphatic instead of the Simple Pronouns. Since the Simple Pronouns are inserted as Direct Objects, it is plain that their use offers no phonetic difficulty.
- (3) It seems altogether irreconcilable with the manner in which Indirect Objects are inserted into the Simple Past.

In this Tense the *a* occurs, but it is separated from the Pronoun by the Tense-sign *ked*. Such a separation is intelligible if that *a* be a separate word with a function of its own; but it becomes inexplicable if that *a* be really but the first syllable of the Emphatic Pronoun. In the Simple Past Direct Pronominal Objects stand between the Tense Suffix and the Copula *a*. Thus—

R. of Pr.	Tens. S.		D. O.	Cop.	Subj.
Lel	- ked'		- ko	- a	- ing,—I saw <i>them</i> .

In the case of Indirect Objects the *Simple* Pronoun occupies the same position, but the *a* which in other Tenses stands immediately before the Pronoun, and thus gives it the appearance of an Emphatic Pronoun, stands here before the Tense Suffix *ked*. Thus—

R. of Pr.		T. S.	I. O.	C.	S.
Om	- a	- ked	- ko	- a	- ing,—I gave (it) <i>to them</i> .

On the other hand, if the rule marked (II) be admitted as correct, then these Indirect Object forms receive a rational explanation. For, since the relation described above attaches necessarily to Indirect Objects and to them only, it is natural that that relation should be expressed by a separate word; even as it is expressed in English by the

words *to*, *at*, etc., etc. But the *a* which occurs either mediately or immediately before the Simple Pronouns is the only word to which that function could be attributed in these constructions.

Two objections may be urged against the view taken here about the nature and function of the *a* under consideration, viz.—

- (a) Demonstrative roots denoting relations of space, time, etc., are in Mundari either Suffixes (Postpositions) or Infixes. Why should *a* if it mean *to*, *for*, *at*, etc., be a Prefix or a Preposition?
- (b) If in the Tenses enumerated above, the relation attaching to Indirect Objects be expressed by the Preposition *a*, why is it not so expressed in a number of other Tenses, viz., in the Indefinite Present, the Indeterminate and Past Static Tenses, in the Anterior Future, the Perfect, the Pluperfect, and in all the corresponding Imperfects? In these, Indirect Pronominal Objects are the Simple Pronouns, *v. gr.*, Omjad-ko-aing may mean I give them (the living beings) and, I give *to* them. Here circumstances and the context must decide whether the Inserted Pronoun be a Direct or an Indirect Object. Since the relation attaching to Indirect Objects is not expressed in these Tenses, why should it be expressed in the others?

It may be replied: If these objections be real difficulties against the view defended here, they are at any rate not only no support to the opposite one, but go against it as much and even more; for, to begin with the second objection, it may be said with the same pertinence: If the *Emphatic Personal Pronouns* are inserted as *Indirect Objects* in a certain number of Tenses, why are they not inserted in all Tenses? Why do some Tenses insert the Simple Pronouns as Indirect Objects and others the Emphatic Pronouns? If it be answered that in some Tenses the *a* of the Emphatic Pronouns is dropped for some phonetic reason, then that same phonetic reason holds good also for dropping the same *a* as Preposition. This objection therefore does not touch the question at all, but especially it leaves to the difficulty of the Past Tense its whole force against the supposition of the rule (I).

To the first of the above two objections it may be replied, first, in general, that the particular position of words in connection with each other is not so essential as to allow, from it alone, conclusions concerning the function of words, if those conclusions be not

supported by any other intrinsic reason. Second, in particular, if it be true that, generally speaking, Demonstrative Mundari roots are Suffixes and in some cases Infixes, it is also true that two or more such Demonstrative roots concur with each other to express certain ideas. In these cases, then, one of those Demonstrative roots must stand first. Now Pronouns are Demonstrative roots primarily denoting relations of space, just as well as the so-called Postpositions. And it is particularly true that in all propositions the Simple Mundari Pronouns never take any Suffix. So much so that, when it is necessary to specify them by some Postposition, the Simple forms are no longer used, but the Emphatic ones take their place, even there where no kind of emphasis is required. Thus *with them* must be rendered by *ako-ló* and not by the Simple *ko-ló*. The Simple Pronouns are always Suffixes or Infixes in Mundari, whereas the Emphatic ones are always independent words. Consequently it may be said that from the very fact that Indirect Objects are Infixes, it follows that those forms are not Emphatic but Simple Pronouns; and since Simple Pronouns never take any specifying Suffixes, it follows that, if a Demonstrative root be required at all to specify them, that root will *precede* the Pronoun. This conclusion derives additional strength from the fact that in the Simple Past the *a* which is here described as a distinct Demonstrative precedes the Pronoun not immediately, but mediately.

A'.—The following constructions, identical in Mundari, but widely differing from each other in English, deserve particular attention:—

1st.—When Nouns or Pronouns *denoting living beings* depend on Compound Postpositions, whether of rest or motion, they take the Suffix *á*. But Nouns and Pronouns *denoting inanimate objects*, depending on the same Postpositions, take no Suffix.

It is to this difference of construction between words denoting *living beings* and words denoting *inanimate objects* that attention is drawn—

Aiarre denotes rest, and means *before, ahead, in front*.

Aiarte denotes motion, and means *ahead, beyond, in front, before*.

Remain before me,—*Aiñ-á aiarre tainme*. Remain before the tree,—*Daru aiarre tainme*.

Go before, *i.e.*, beyond me,—*Aiñ-á aiarte senóme*. Go before the tree,—*Daru aiarte senóme*.

2nd.—*To have* and *not to have* are rendered by *mená*, to exist, and *banó*, not to exist, respectively. In the phrases where this meaning is attached to *mená* and *banó*, the word denoting the object or being

possessed, stands as Subject to the Predicates *mená* or *banó*, whereas the word denoting the owner takes the Suffix *á*—

I have land, *Aiñ-á ote mená*. He has no money,—*Ae-á taka banó*.

3rd.—*Possessive Genitives*, depending on words denoting *inanimate objects*, are formed by suffixing *á* to the word denoting the owner—

The country of the Mundas,—*Horoko-á disum*.

4th.—Nouns or Pronouns take the Suffix *á* when they stand as Indirect Objects to the following Predicates:—

- (a) those that denote a real or moral transfer ;
- (b) those that denote the commission of a wrong to others ;
- (c) those that denote subjective states of mind or feelings towards others.

In 2nd, 3rd, and 4th we have again words denoting living beings which take the Suffix *á* ; for the construction under 2nd as well as the Possessive Genitive in *á* are strictly reserved for denoting *ownership* in the real sense of that term. Our more loosely used Possessive Genitives are in Mundari all Locatives, rendered by Postpositions exclusively denoting rest in space.

The following considerations will show—first, that this *á* is a complete root in itself, the same in all four constructions ; secondly, that it is identical with the *a* described above, which precedes Indirect Inserted Pronominal Objects.

The relation denoted by *á* in 1st is, of course, merely a spatial one. But the *á* does not in any way indicate the exact position in space. This is done by the particular Compound Postpositions occurring in this construction, such as *aiarre*, *aiarte*, *taiomre*, etc., etc.

What, then, does *á* express? Evidently nothing beyond the very *elementary relation of externality* to the speaker in the sentence *aiñá aiarre*: in other sentences, such as, *v. gr.*, *Dasiá aiarre* in front of the servant it denotes the *mere relation of externality to a subject or living being*.

In this construction, then, the intellect has not superadded anything as yet to the simple element of space primarily denoted by *á*. Here *á* may be translated very approximately into English by—*With regard to*. Thus, *Aiñá aiarre tainme* may be literally rendered by—*Remain in front with regard to me*.

In the construction under 2nd the intellect superadds something to this elementary relation of space, viz., the relation of ownership. That the relation of space is the real substratum of the relation of

ownership in this *á* is evident from the fact that in Mundari the *á* may in this construction be replaced by *táre*, meaning *near* or *about me*. Thus, I have land may be rendered by—*Aiñ-á ote mená* or *Aing táre ote mená*. This shows at the same time how the mind may transfer meanings from the material to the mental or moral sphere by simply superadding mental or moral to the material elements, bearing some analogy to the latter, and that without making use of special words or roots for the purpose.

Here, then, as in the *a* of the Indirect Pronominal Objects, *á* contains a double element, viz., first a relation of space as a substratum, and, secondly, a moral relation, ownership, implying an advantage to a living being or subject. Here, too, the element of space is nearly effaced, whereas the moral side is chiefly insisted on. The only difference lies in this that here the ownership (advantage) is considered as remaining with the subject, whilst in the Indirect Object forms it is considered as being transferred from one individual to another. But this difference is mainly due to the different meanings of the Predicates.

The relation expressed by *á* in the third construction, viz., the Possessive Genitives in *á* is quite identical with the one that has just been described. This *á*, then, cannot be looked upon as a mere declensional desineness, the resultant of phonetic decay, which has no longer any meaning if taken by itself alone, but it is really a complete Postposition of space with a transferred meaning. This is further shown by the fact that other Possessive Genitives, viz., those depending on Nouns denoting living beings, are formed by means of the Postpositions *re* + the Demonstrative *n*, i.e., *ren* or by *tare* + *n*, i.e., *táren*. And those Genitive Suffixes may be replaced by *á*; though for reasons given in the Chapter on Equivalents of Declensions, the forms *ren* and *táren* be preferred. Thus, the servant of Paku may be rendered either by *Pakutáren* *dasi*; literally, the servant, the one near or about Paku, or by *Pakudá* *dasi*; literally, the servant to Paku.

If this *á* be, according to the genius of the language, used intransitively, it must be considered as a Participle, and becomes equivalent to a Relative clause. Hence we get literally, *Horokoá disum*, the country *which is to* the Mundas.

The relation denoted by *á* in 4th is the very same as that denoted by *a* in most of the Indirect Pronominal Objects. It is a real *Dativus incommodi*, just like the Latin in *Tibi peccavi*.

Now, if the meaning and function here attributed to *á* be admitted, the four constructions under consideration receive a rational explanation;

and it is readily perceived why the *á* should be used in all of them. Furthermore, it becomes evident that this *á* is in reality the same as the *a* which introduces Indirect Pronominal Objects, the loss of the sound denoted by (') in the latter being due merely to the position *á* occupies when it introduces those Indirect Objects.

If the above considerations have any real value, the following would be a correct description of *á*:

A' is a complete, original, Demonstrative root, primarily denoting one of the most simple relations of space, viz., *that of mere externality to a subject or living being*, or that which is implied when a subject considers some entity as out of and distinct from its own self.

This relation is generally transferred to the moral region. The analogy on which the mind bases this transfer seems to be the fact that in the spatial relation just described a certain proximity to the subject is implied, since the subject and the object are, as it were, placed over against each other on account of the complete abstraction made of everything else in the concept thus formed: hence the transfer to anything which is considered as closely related to the subject by affecting him directly either agreeably or disagreeably. That connection exists unmistakeably (*a*) in pleasurable or painful subjective affections; (*b*) in the relation contained in the notion of ownership; (*c*) in that which is implied in the transfer of ownership.

A' (*1st*) Is used to form the Possessive case of Nouns denoting living beings. In this function it is suffixed —

(*a*) To Nouns denoting an owner when ever those Nouns depend on a word denoting inanimate objects, and sometimes when they depend on words denoting living beings. Hence it means *of*

Paku-á ora,—The house of Paku. *Dasi-á talab*.—The wages of the servant.

When thus suffixed to Pronouns it yields ... *Possessive Adjectives*.

Ain-á ote, my land. *Am-á sadom*, thy horse.
Ae-á lijá, his cloth. *Ape-á disum*, your country.

(*b*) To Nouns and Pronouns denoting an owner, when they depend on the Predicates *mená* or *banó*. Thus it literally means ... *to*.

Ako-á ote purá mená,—There is much land to them.

A'—(concluded).

But together with *mená* and *banó* it must be rendered into English by ... *to have or not to have.*

- (2nd) It is suffixed to words denoting living beings when these depend on Compound Positions of rest or motion in space or of priority and posteriority in time. Thus it might strictly be rendered by ... *with regard to.*
- But it has generally ... *no English equivalent.*

Aih-d aiarre senóme,—Walk in front of me.
Ako-d taiomre hijúme,—Come after them (i.e., later than they).

- (3rd) It is suffixed to Nouns and Pronouns standing as Indirect Objects to words meaning to offend against, to commit or cause a personal injury to, and means ... *against.*

Abu sobenko *Pormesor-d*-bu papkeda,—We all have sinned against God. *Ini-d* gunakedae,—He has committed an injury or injustice against him, also; he has violated her.

- (4th) It is used as a Preposition to introduce Inserted Indirect Pronominal Objects in the following Tenses: the Indeterminate, the Future, the Definite Present, the Simple Past, the corresponding Imperfects and in the Imperative, and means ... *to, for, at, against, with, on behalf of.*

In this position it loses the sound denoted by (').

Om-a-meae,—He will give it *to* thee. Kami-a-koae,—He will work *for* them. Suku-a-bentanako,—They are satisfied *with* both of you.

NOTE.—The Postposition *d* is identical in form with the Neuter or Impersonal Pronoun. It may now be asked—Is this identity of form a merely casual resemblance or are the Post-position and the Pronoun but two different functions of one and the same primary root?

If the views expressed here concerning the nature of the Postposition, and those given in the preceding chapter concerning the Impersonal Pronoun be correct, it follows that the

Postposition and the Pronoun are in reality nothing else than *differently developed functions of one and the same root*. A short summing up will bear out this statement—

1st.—*Pronouns* are Demonstrative roots, primarily destined to point out relations of space. Those relations of space have, in the Pronouns, all reference to the Ego or Self, *i.e.*, they show how Self is related to other entities.

2nd.—*Postpositions* are Demonstrative roots which are also primarily destined to denote relations of space. But in the case of Postpositions those relations do not necessarily refer to the Ego or Self. The relations denoted by these may exist either between the Ego and the Non-Ego, or they may exist between two or more beings out of the Ego. Hence the original function of Pronouns and Postpositions is *generally* the same, *i.e.*, that of denoting relations of space. To this *generically identical function* the mind adds *specifically divergent functions or specifications* in either case.

3rd.—*The Impersonal Pronoun* in particular has for its own specific function to denote inanimate objects as out of and distinct from the Ego or Self : hence the relation denoted by it is that of *externality* with regard to *Self, i.e.*, to ONE PARTICULAR *living being*.

4th.—*The Postposition á* has for its *specific* function to denote the same relation of externality, not exclusively to a particular living being, *i.e.*, Self, but to LIVING BEINGS IN GENERAL.

The relation, then, denoted by both the Pronoun and the Postposition is in this case *specifically* the same, though somewhat more extensive in the case of the Postposition than in that of the Pronoun.

The fact that the Postposition *á* is, in all the functions it performs as such, invariably referred TO LIVING ENTITY gives an additional significance to the *specific identity* of function attaching to the Pronoun and the Postposition, and goes far to prove that the Postposition and the Pronoun are one and the same root. The Pronoun is of course prior to the Postposition. Now the Pronoun *essentially* refers to living entity. Hence, if this particular Pronoun be used with the function of a Postposition, it is natural that it should be reserved for relations referring to *living* beings. Furthermore, *á* is the *only* Postposition thus limited to relations referring to living beings. This limitation finds a rational explanation, if the Postposition be considered as a particular function of the Pronominal root ; otherwise it remains unexplained.

Ate or *Ete*—Primarily denotes motion *from* a place, and

means *from, out of.*

The purely spatial meaning of *te* is very restricted. The original or spatial meaning of *ate* or *ete* is also restricted, though not with the same rigour as the primary meaning of *te*. The spatial function of *ate* or *ete* is by no means co-extensive with the spatial function of the English Preposition *from* ; for whenever some living being or inanimate object is considered *in its totality* as the *terminus* from the immediate vicinity of which the motion takes place, *ate* or *ete* may no longer be used to render the English Preposition *from* (see *laale, táete* p. 52).

(I) In its primary meaning *ate* or *ete* is restricted—

(1) To words primarily and directly signifying *space* or *places*, such as Common and Proper Nouns of countries, islands, towns, etc., etc.

Bilait-*ate*-ko aulá,—They brought it *from* Europe.
Ranchi-*ete* ling hijúlana,—He and I came *from* Ranchi.
Bir-*ete*-e nirurungjana,—He ran *out of* or *from* the forest.
Buru-*ete* argunjanae,—He came down *from* the mountain.
Ora-*ete* nirjanae,—He ran away *from* home (from the house).

Sadom-*ete* argunme,—Come down *from* the horse.
Daru-*ete*-e uiújana,—He fell *from* the tree.
Chauli en tunki-*ete* dularungme,—Pour the rice *out of* that basket.
Liya-*ete* mod' takae urunglá,—He took a rupee *out of* his cloth.

(2) To Nouns and Pronouns denoting living beings or inanimate objects there and then considered as containers or receptacles.

REMARK.—In some cases really or apparently falling under the restrictions laid down above, the Mundas use *re* where we would expect *ate* or *ete*. This is the case (a) where the idea of motion is not attended to, because it is quite secondary; (b) where in reality there is no motion at all, though in English the Preposition *from* be used.

(a) Puru-*re* jomme,—Eat *out of* or *from* a leaf-plate.
iala-*re* nájadae,—He drinks *out of* the cup.

(b) Ale hatu han buru-*re* lelóa,—Our village can be seen *from* yonder mountain.
Ne kitab-*re* moiod' baria pirist parauaingme,—Read a couple of pages to me *from* this book.

(II) Suffixed to Nouns and Pronouns denoting living beings not considered there and then as containers or receptacles, *ate* or *ete* implies a *parting with*, a *separation from*, some object possessed, a *privation*, a *moral separation*, and means *from*.

Hence, the Compounds thus obtained are equivalent to such English Ablatives as depend on the Verb *to get*, *to receive*, *to accept*, *to take*, *to steal*, etc., and *their synonyms*—

Inku-*ete*-ng namtada,—I got it *from* them. Munda-*ete*-m kiringlá chi?—Didst thou buy it *from* the

te or *ete*—(*concl'd.*)

village chief? Gomke-*ete*-king kum brulá,—The two have stolen it *from* the master.

REMARK.—The Predicates *kumburu*, to steal; *re*, to rob; *hole*, to strip, to take off, and synonyms are generally construed with a double Accusative. Thus, They stole him his land. They robbed them their money.

The Noun denoting the living being from whom something is stolen, etc., must consequently be repeated in the shape of an Inserted Direct Pronominal Object.

Samu oteko kumburuk-i-a,—They stole Samu's land. *Sehoratanko* takako raked'-*ko*-a,—They robbed the travelers of their money. *Chaprassi* sonoking holek-i-a,—They (the two) stripped the chaprassi of his coat.

(III) Transferred to time, *ate* or *ete* denotes the beginning of a period intervening between two events or between two points in time. Hence (1) to denote the time intervening between some past moment and the present, it is suffixed to Nouns or Adverbs denoting the past, and means ... *Since, ever since, from, for.*

Hola-*ete* bangáia,—He is absent *since* yesterday. Maha-*ete* misao kaing lelkiá,—I did not see him once *ever since* last year, or *for* the whole of last year. En hulang-*ete* kaking eperangjana,—*From* that day they did no more quarrel with each other.

(2) When it is necessary to specify both the first and the last moment of a period, whether past or future, *ate* or *ete* is suffixed to the word which denotes the beginning of the period, whereas the word denoting the end of the period takes one of the Suffixes *jaked' hamí* or *táte, to*. Here, then, *ate* or *ete* becomes a correlative to *jaked', hamí* or *táte*, and together with one of these it means ... *from ... to.*

REMARK.—The strong form *ate* is generally used when there is question of a great distance or of a very remote time.

Munu-*ate* bongakole sewakoa, enamente não kale bagedari-koa,—*Ever since* the very beginning we (Mundas) are worshipping the spirits. Therefore we cannot give them up now.

In ordinary cases *ete* is much more frequently used than *ate*. It may be said that *ate* occurs only for the sake of euphony.

N.B.—The initial *e* of *ete* is very short and weak, especially when preceded by a vowel. Thus, for instance, a foreigner unaccustomed as yet to the language will find it difficult to distinguish between *daru-te*, with the tree, and *daru-ete*, from the tree; *orá-te*, to the house, and *orá-ete*, from the house.

Tare—Denotes rest within a certain area—

1st.—Suffixed to *Proper* or *Common Nouns* signifying space or places, it means ... about, some-

In connection with these Nouns it yields what where near, might be called an *Indefinite Locative of rest*. in the vicinity

The *Definite Locative* of rest of the same of, in the surroundings of. Nouns is formed by means of the Suffix *re*, *v.gr.*, *Ranchi-re*, in Ranchi. *Burure*,—On the mountain.

Ranchi-táre-ko taintana,—They dwell somewhere near Ranchi.

2nd.—Suffixed to other Nouns or Pronouns it means ... with, near.

In connection with these therefore it yields the *Definite Locative of rest*—

Han daru-táre-e namóá,—You will find him near yonder tree. *Ale-táre kako taina*,—They will not remain with or near us.

3rd.—In its transferred meaning *táre* denotes possession both in the strict and wider sense of the term. This meaning, however, requires to be completed by means of the Predicates *mená*, to be, and *banó*, not be.

Hence together with *mená* and *banó*, *táre* means ... to have or not

In this construction the name of the beings to have. and objects possessed, or of the persons over whom a certain right is exercised, stands as Subject of the proposition; *mená* or *banó* stands as Predicate, and the Noun or Pronoun denoting the owner stands as Indirect Object with the Suffix *táre*.

Gomke-täre taka mená,—The master *has* money.
(Literally, With the master there is money.)
Ale-täre dasiko bankoá,—We *have* no servants.
(Literally, With us there are no servants.)

4th.—The Predicates *urú*, to long for, to yearn after, and *asrai*, to hope, to look to some one for something, to expect something from some one, always require *täre* as Suffix to their Indirect Object, i.e. to the Noun or Pronoun denoting the object or being for which one longs, or the person from whom one expects something or to whom one looks for something. Hence here *täre* means

... *for, after, in,*
to, from.

Engate-täre-e urútana,—He yearns *after* his mother. (Literally, he thinks towards his mother.)
Orá-täre-ko urútana,—They are homesick. (Literally, they think towards their house or home.)
Am-täre-le asraitana,—We hope *in* thee, or we look *to thee* (for help, counsel, etc.).

5th.—The Predicates *suku*, to be pleased with, to be satisfied with, to agree with; *ka* ... *suku*, to be displeased with, to be dissatisfied with, to disagree with, and *kisió*, to be angry with, are sometimes construed in a similar manner.

Hence in connection with Indirect Objects to these, *täre* means

... *with, towards,*
against.

Mundako-täre khube sukutana,—He is very well disposed *towards* the village-chiefs. *Am-täre kae sukutana*,—He does not agree with thee. *A-king-täre kented'ko kisiakana*,—They are very angry *against* both of them.

Täre—

Denotes motion towards.

1st.—Suffixed to Nouns denoting space or places, it yields an *Indefinite Locative of motion*. The *Definite Locative of motion* of these Nouns is formed by means of *te*; for in connection with these Nouns, *te* points out the exact

terminus of the motion, whereas *tâte* points out the direction of the motion only in a rather vague manner.

Hence it means *... towards, in the direction of.*

Hatu-*tâte*-ko senójana,—They went away *towards* the village. Orá-*tâte*-e nirjana,—He ran *towards* the house. Sirma-*tâte*-e sangilrakablá,—He looked up *towards* heaven.

2nd.—Suffixed to other Nouns and Pronouns, it assumes the same definite meaning which *te* has when suffixed to Nouns denoting space or places.

Hence it yields a *Definite Locative* of motion, and means *... to, up to.*

Han daru-*tâte* senóme,—Go *up to* yonder tree. Ale-*tâte*-king niraulá,—Both came running *up to* us.

Tâte or Denotes motion from—

Tâte.

1st.—Suffixed to Nouns denoting space or places it yields an *Indefinite Locative of motion* from, and means *... from the surroundings or the side of, from somewhere near.*

Ranchi-*tâte*-ko hijúlena,—They have come from somewhere near Ranchi.

2nd.—Suffixed to other Nouns and Pronouns, it yields a *Definite Locative* of motion from, and means *... from.*

Sadam-*tâte* nirme,—Run away *from* the horse. Sengel-*tâte* iditam,—Take it away *from* (near) the fire. But Sengel-*ete* urungtam,—Take it *out of* the fire.

3rd.—It is suffixed to Nouns and Pronouns denoting living beings, when they stand as Indirect Objects to the Passive Predicates—*kuló*, to be sent; *chutió*, to be dismissed,

although the idea of motion be no longer either the only nor even the primary one implied. In this connection therefore it yields an equivalent to some of the Organic Ablatives, and must be rendered by *from, by.*

Raja-táete-ko kuljana,—They were sent *by* the king. *Ale-táete-king chutijana*,—Both of them were dismissed *by* us.

Nouns denoting inanimate objects take *ete* when standing as Indirect Objects to those Passives, *v.gr.*, *Jehel-ete-king chutijana*,—Both were dismissed from prison.

REMARK.—In *táete* and *táete* the *á* is checked very slightly, and the second *a* of *táate* as well as the *e* of *táete* are very short. Hence *táate* sounds almost like *táte*, and *táete* may easily be mistaken for *táte*.

Sáre, sáte } Are equivalents of *táre táte, táate* or *táete*, and are
sáate and *sáete*. } used about as frequently as *táre*, etc., etc.

Nouns and Pronouns denoting living beings take the Suffix *á* when they depend on any of the compounds to be enumerated below. *V. gr.*, *Iniá aiarre tainme*,—Remain in front of him.

For the explanation of this construction see above (pages 39 and 40).

Aiar is both a Transitive and an Intransitive Predicate, meaning *to precede, to be, or go ahead, to continue*. *V. gr.*, *Aiarkom!* Precede them. *Alom aiara!* Don't go further! don't go ahead! *Aiarne mar!* Continue your narration! Go on with what you have to say.

N.B.—The form *aiár*, a variation produced by the *i*, is rather rarely used.

Taiom is a Transitive and Intransitive Predicate, meaning *to be behind, to come or to go behind, to lag behind, to come later, to put something or some one behind*, *v. gr.*, *Taiomime!* Go behind him or put him behind! Put him at the end!

In the sense of *to lag behind, to come behind* or *to come later* it is generally used in the Passive form, *v.gr.*, *Taiomótanae*,—He is lagging behind. *Taiomjanako*,—They remained behind; they could not keep up with the others.

Doia or *dea* is primarily a Noun, meaning *the back*.

Sida is an Ordinal Numeral Adverb, meaning *first*.

Chetan is a Transitive and Intransitive Predicate, meaning to be above, to put or place above, to be on the top of, to put or place on the top of.

Suba is the contrary of *chetan*, and means to be underneath, to be beneath, to put or place beneath.

Sirma denotes the cover, the roof; also the heavens. It is also used as a Transitive or Intransitive Predicate, meaning to raise on high, to lift on high, to be on high (Passive).

Latar is a Transitive and Intransitive Predicate, meaning to lower, to put lower, to be below (Passive).

Tala is used both as a Noun and as a Transitive and Intransitive Predicate, meaning (1) the middle, (2) to divide in the middle, to halve, to trace the middle.

Racha denotes an open place outside in front of the house, a kind of small yard.

Kundam corresponds to *racha*, and denotes a place outside at the back of the house.

Biter is the Mundaricised Hindi word *bhitar*, inside. In its original form, i.e., without Suffix, it is a Predicate, meaning to be inside (Passive), to put or place something inside.

Danang is a Transitive and Intransitive Predicate, meaning to screen, to hide behind something, to be screened or hidden (Passive).

Japa is a Transitive and Intransitive Predicate, meaning to be close (Passive), to put close by, to place against.

Gena denotes the edge or border, v.gr., of rivers, seas, lands. It may be used too as Predicate, meaning to go along.

Atom denotes the edge or side of something. Used as Predicate, it means to put something aside, to remove something away from.

The words enumerated above take the Suffixes *tá*, *te*, *täre*, *tâte*, *tâte* or *tâte*, and thus yield the following set of Compound Postpositions. The Postpositions thus obtained are not Suffixes, but they occupy an independent position. They always stand immediately after the Nouns or Pronouns they govern, v.gr., *Gara genatee senjana*,—He went to the riverside.

Aiartá is used of space. Its meaning is very vague (cfr. *tá*). It denotes both motion and rest within an ill-defined area, and means somewhere ahead.

Aiarre (1st) used of space denotes
rest, and means ... before, ahead of, in front of.

Sadomá *aiarre* alom tinguna!—Don't stand in front of the horse. Mej
aiarre dubme,—Sit before the table.

(2nd) used of time, it means ... ago.

Monre sirma *aiarre* neree taekena,—He was here five years ago.

Aiartüre denotes rest, but it is less { somewhere ahead;
precise than *aiarre*, and means ... } somewhere in front.

Aiarte denotes motion and indicates
the direction in a precise manner,
and means ... ahead, in front.

Aiñá *aiarte* senóme,—Go straight in front of me.

Aiartäte denotes motion, but indi-
cates the direction more vaguely
than *aiarte*, and means ... somewhere in front.

Aiarete denotes motion from, in a
definite direction, and means ... from in front of.

Aiartäate or *aiartäete* denotes mo-
tion from, in a vaguer way, and
means ... from somewhere in front of.

Taiomre denotes rest in a definite
place, and means ... behind.

Iniá *taiomre* tainme,—Remain behind him.

Taiomtäre denotes rest within a less
well-defined area, and means ... somewhere behind.

Taiomte (1st) used of space, it denotes
motion towards, and means ... after.

(2nd) used of time, it means ... after.

Aleá *taiomteko* hijúlana,—They came after us, i.e., they came later than
we. Api ma *taiomte* hijúruareme,—Come back after three days.

Taiomate or *taiomete* denotes motion {
from, in a definite way, i.e., indi- } from behind something;
cates the exact terminus from, } from behind someone.
and means ...

Taiomtáate or *taiomtáate* denotes likewise *motion from*, but does not precise the terminus from, in the same manner as *taiomete*. It means *from somewhere behind*.

Doeare, deare is used only as Definite Locative of rest of the Noun *dea*, back, and means *on the back*.

Doeate or *deate* is the corresponding Definite Locative of motion of the same Noun.

The Suffixes *táre, táte, táate (tácte)* in connection with *doea (dea)* yield Compounds equivalent in meaning to *taiomtáre* or *taiomre, taiomte* or *taiomtáte, taiomete* or *tiomtáete*. But these Compounds with *dea* are, of course, restricted to cases where the Noun or Pronoun governed denotes human beings.

Sidare is used of time. It is added to a word or phrase denoting a period of time, and denotes that a certain event preceded that period. The precedence thus signified is not an immediate one, but a more or less vague one. Hence *sidare* may be translated by *more than ... ago*.

Mod'hisi sirma *sidareng* lelked'koa,—I saw them (once) more than 20 years ago.

Sidate (1st) is used of time, and, like *sidare*, suffixed to Nouns or phrases signifying a period of time. It denotes that a certain action took place previous to that period. The precedence thus signified seems to be more definite, i.e., immediately preceding the period indicated. Hence it means *ago*.

Monre sirma *sidate* nereng lelked'koa,—I saw them here five years ago.

(2nd) Suffixed to Nouns or Pronouns denoting living beings, it points out priority of one action or state over another, whether in the past or in the future, and means *before*.

Aiñá *sidadeko* senkena,—They went before me, *i.e.*, before I went. Amá *sidade-e* senóka,—Let him go *before* thee, *i.e.*, *before* thou wilt start.

Sidaate, *sidaete* points out a period }
 lasting from some more or less }
 well-defined moment of the past } *ever since*;
 up to the present time, and } *ever since ... ago*.
 means

Mimid' sirma *sidaate* Horoko Chutia Nagporre menákoa,—The Mundas are (settled) in Chota Nagpore ever since year upon year, *i.e.*, from time immemorial. Moṛre. sirma *sidaete* nereng kamitangea,—I am working here ever since five years ago.

Chetanre denotes rest, and means ... *on the top or summit of*.

Buru *chetanre*,—On the summit of the mountain.

Chetante denotes motion to, and means *to the top or summit of*.

Chetanate, *chetanete* denotes motion from, and means *from the top or summit of*.

To the above correspond the more indefinite Compounds :

Chetantāre *somewhere on the top of*.

Chetantāte *somewhere to the top of*.

Chetantāete *somewhere from the top of*.

Subare denotes rest, and means ... *near, underneath of, under*.

Mej *subare*,—Under the table, *i.e.*, near the legs of the table.

Subate denotes motion to, and means *under, underneath*.

Daru *subat*, nirme,—Run *under* the tree, *i.e.*, close to the trunk of the tree.

Subaete denotes motion from, and means *from underneath*.

To these correspond the more indefinite compounds: *subátáre*, *subatááte*, *subatááte* or *sub'tááte*.

Sirmare denotes rest, and must
sometimes be rendered by ... *under, from, to*.

Orá *sirmare* hakakana,—It is hanging *under the house-roof*. Nájomko daru *sirmare* ko hakakoa,—They would hang sorcerers to the branches of a tree.

More frequently it must be rendered
by *on, upon*.

Orá *sirmaree* tingukana,—He is standing *on the top or roof of the house*.

Sirmate denotes motion to, and
means *up to, to, to the top or roof*.

Sirmaete denotes motion from, and
means *from, from the top or roof of*.

REMARK.—These three compounds are limited in their function as Postpositions to such words as denote houses, rooms, etc., *i.e.*, to covered or ceiled places.

Latarre denotes rest, and means ... *under, underneath*.

Latarte denotes motion to, and means *under, underneath*.

Latarete (*latarate*) denotes motion
from, and means *from underneath*.

To these correspond the more indefinite compounds: *latartáre*, *latartááte*, *latartááte* or *latartááte*.

REMARK.—*Latarre latarte, etc.*, is used only to denote the underneath of a covered place or a space, big or small, under some object, which allows of putting or showing something under that object. Thus *mej latarre*, underneath the table; *Toپی latarre*, under the hat.

Subare, subate, etc., is used to denote the lower end of something. *V. gr.*, There where a tree-trunk or a wall rises out of the ground. Daru *subaree* dubakana,—He is sitting under the tree, *i.e.*, on the ground near the trunk. Daru *lataree* dubakana,—He is sitting under the kind of roof made by the projecting branches.

However, with regard to trees, *suba* is almost exclusively used even when the immediate proximity to the trunk is not strictly implied.

Amá kata *subareng* uíántana,—I throw myself at thy feet. Ama kata *latarre* mená,—It is underneath thy foot, *i.e.*, thou art treading or standing upon it.

Hence the compounds with *suba* are the contraries of those with *chetan*, whereas the compounds with *latar* are the contraries of those with *sirma*.

Tala denotes rest—

1st.—Suffixed to Nouns denoting
space or places, it means ... *in the middle or the centre*
of.

2nd.—Suffixed to other Nouns, it
means *amongst, among.*

Talate denotes motion to, and means { (1) *to the middle or centre*
of.

Talaete denotes motion from, and { (1) *from the middle of.*
means (2) *from amongst.*

To these correspond the indefinite compounds: *talatäre, talatäte, talatâte* or *talatâte.*

Biterre denotes rest, and means ... *inside, in the interior of.*

Biterte denotes motion to, and means *into the interior of, inside.*

Biterete denotes motion from, and
means *from inside of, from the*
interior of.

Add to these the indefinite compounds: *bitertäre, bitertäte, biter-
tâte* or *bitertâte.*

Rachare, rachate, etc., as well as *kundamre, kundamte, etc., etc.*, being
entirely restricted to designate a small place out in front or at the
back of the house are Adverbs of Place rather than Postpositions.

Danangre denotes rest, and means ... *behind, under cover of.*

Danangte denotes motion to, and
means *behind.*

Danangete denotes motion from, and
means *from behind.*

Add to these the indefinite compounds: *danangtäre, danangtäte, danangtâte.*

REMARK.—The Compounds with *danang* are used only when it is actually desired to imply
that a living being or an object is actually hidden from sight by that behind which it is said
to be. Hence *Iniá danangre tingakana*,—He is standing behind him so as to be hidden
from view. But *Iniá taiomree tingakana*,—He stands behind him and can be seen.

Genare denotes rest, and means ... *on the border or the side*
of, near, along.

Genate denotes motion to, and means *to the side of, etc.*

Genacte denotes motion from, and
means *from the side of, etc.*

Add *genatäre, genatäte, genatäete* or
genatäate.

Atomre denotes rest, and means ... *at the side, on the side, on
the edge, on the extremity
of.*

Atomte denotes motion to, and means *to the side, etc., etc.*

Atomete denotes motion from, and
means *from the side, etc.*

Add *Atomtäre, atomtäte, atomtäete* or *atomtäete*.

REMARK.—*Atomre*, etc., etc., are used of the outer edge or side of any object, whereas
genare, etc., are used only of rivers, seas, tracts of land, villages, etc.

Both sets of compounds are frequently reduplicated. In this case only the repeated form
takes the Suffixes *re, te*, etc., etc., *v. gr.*, *Gara gena genare tainme*,—Remain close along the
riverside.

These reduplications are sometimes used without the Suffixes *re, te*, etc., *v. gr.*, *Gara gena
gena senme*,—Go close along the riverside.

Japare denotes rest, in the immediate
proximity to something or some-
one, and means *close to, quite near to,
against.*

Japate denotes motion to, and means *against, up to.*

Japaete denotes motion from, and
means *from against, from close to.*

Japare, etc.—Differ from *atomre, etc.*, in this that the first indicate
a point or place in immediate vicinity to or even contact with an object
or living being, but still outside of it; whereas *atomre, etc.*, denote
the outer surface or limit of an object; thus *Mej atomre dotam*,—Put it
on the edge of the table. But *Mej japare dotam*,—Place it near the
table or against the table.

Hami, habi, habid' or *hamé*—Indicate
the distance between two points or
the duration of a motion to, and
point out the exact terminus of
that distance or the motion ... *to, up to, until.*

They may be used alone or with the Suffix *te*—

Ne daruete han daru ham or *han daru hamite*—From this tree up to yonder
tree.

The word indicating the terminus sometimes takes the Suffix *tá*—
Han darutá hamí senóme,—Go (from here) up to yonder tree.

Mente is the Instrumental Case of *men*,
to say. It performs a variety of
functions in connection with
subordinate clauses. It has been
transferred also to the function
of a Postposition governing Nouns
and Pronouns. In this function
it is synonymous with *nagente*,
etc., and means ... *for, on behalf of.*

Nouns and Pronouns depending on *mente* never take the Suffix *á*—
Am *menteng* auakada,—I brought this for thee. Honme *mentee* kiringlá,—
He bought it for thy son.

Sam—Of Hindi origin, is used in some
expressions as a synonym to *ló*,
with, and means ... *with, together with.*

But it is never used of time. It is generally preceding the Noun
it governs. However, it is also used as a mere Suffix—

Ne daru red'-*sam* tud'urungpe,—Pull out this tree *together with* its roots.
Sam-kagaj ne tunkio hudumaratam,—Pitch away this basket *together with* the
paper that's in it. *Sam-losod'*, besmeared with mud. *Sam-maiom*, besmeared
with blood. *Sam-maiomem* tusingakana,—Thou art dressed (in cloths) *besmeared*
with blood.

Begar, likewise of Hindi origin, is used,
and means ... *without.*

This too precedes the Noun it governs,
and that Noun frequently takes
the Instrumental Suffix *te*—

<i>Begar</i> hake	}	ka mágóa,—There's no cutting without an axe.
or		
<i>begar</i> hakete	}	ka siúa,—There's no ploughing without bullocks.
<i>Begar</i> uriko		
or		
<i>begar</i> urikote		

NOTE.—The genuine Mundari construction consists of a Disjunctive proposition of which
the first member is generally elliptic. If the first member be complete, the second member
is elliptic—

Hakete karedo ka mágóa; *literally.* With an axe or else there is no cutting (it can
not be cut).

Uṛkote karedo ka siṁa,—With bullocks or else there is no ploughing.

Hakete magōa, karedo ka,—With an axe one can cut, otherwise not.

Uṛkote siṁa, karedo ka,—With bullocks one can plough, otherwise not.

The fact that the Mundas often suffix *te* to the Noun governed by *begar* shows that they cannot quite resign themselves to the Hindi construction.

But this is shown still more forcibly by the combination of the Hindi and the Mundarī construction into a jumble which, if literally translated, would mean the opposite of what they intend to say—

Begar sadom karedo kaing sena } I won't go without horse ; *literally*, Without horse or else
 ,, sadomte ,, ,, ,, } I won't go.

Hamiate—Indicates the direction and duration of a motion by pointing out the exact terminus from which it starts, and may be rendered by *all along from, all the while from.*

Han oṛā *hamiateng* niraujada,—I come running all the way from (as far as) yonder house.

Jaked'—Is used both of space and time.

It indicates the terminus of a motion or a duration.

1st.—When *jaked'* is used of space the

Postposition *tā* is frequently suffixed to the word denoting the terminus, and *jaked'* is placed after *tā*. In this construction *jaked'* is synonymous with *hami*,

etc., and may be rendered by ... *up to, as far as.*

Han darutā *jaked'* gōiditam,—Carry it up to yonder tree.

2nd.—Used of time, *jaked'* may be ren-

dered by ... for.

E chanḍu *jaked'* tainóme,—Remain for seven months; stay for the next seven months.

Paromre—Denotes rest, and means ... *across, on the other side of.*

Gara *paromre* tangikom,—Wait for them on the other side of the river.

Paromte—Denotes motion to, and means *across, to the other side.*

Paromete—Denotes motion from, and

means ... from across, from the other side.

Add *paromtāre, paromtāte, paromtāate or paromtāete.*

Horate—Is the Instrumental Case of
hora, way, road. It is always used
 to signify the instrumentality of
 persons, and means *through, by*.

The Noun or Pronoun denoting the person through whom something is done or accomplished takes the Suffix *á*—

Amá horate le banchaujana,—We were saved *by* thee. *Dasid horate ne chiti kultaime*,—Send this letter to him *through* the servant.

Nagen or *nagente*—Has the same function as the Latin *pro*, and means *for, on behalf of*.

Nouns and Pronouns depending on this need not take the Suffix *á*—

Horoko nagente, for the Mundas. Ale, or *aled nagente*, for us, on behalf of us.

V.—NUMERALS.

I.—CARDINAL NUMERALS.

Distinct forms exist for the numbers from *one* to *ten* inclusively, and for the number *twenty*.

The numbers between *ten* and *twenty* are formed by adding the nine first numbers respectively to the word *gel*, 10.

No special Mundari word exists for any number higher than twenty, *hisi*. The higher numbers are divided into stages of twenties: thus 40 is called *bar hisi*, i.e., two twenties; 60 is *api hisi*, i.e., three twenties; 80 is *upun hisi*, i.e., four twenties; 100 is, *monre hisi*, i.e., five twenties; 120 is *turui hisi*, i.e., six twenties, etc.

The numbers from 20 to 40 are formed by adding the nineteen first numbers respectively to *hisi*, or *mid' hisi*: thus, 30 is *mid' hisi geleā*, i.e., one twenty ten; 31 is *mid' hisi gel miad'*, i.e., one twenty ten one.

The numbers from 40 to 60, from 60 to 80, etc., are formed in the same way. Thus, 50 is *bar hisi geleā*, i.e., two twenties ten; 51 is *bar hisi gel miad'*, etc.

The Mundari Numerals are being displaced more and more by the Hindi in districts where Hindi or Sadani is understood by the Mundas, and even in others where these languages are hardly understood at all.

The Hindi words *sau* or *sai*, a hundred, and *hazar* or *hajar*, a thousand, are now in common use almost everywhere.

However, *gel sai*, i.e., ten hundred, occurs still frequently instead of *hajar*, a thousand—

<i>mid', miad', moiad', or mod'</i>	...	1	<i>mid' hisi geleā</i>	30
<i>baria</i>	<i>mid' hisi gel miad'</i>	31
<i>apia</i>	<i>mid' hisi gel baria</i>	32
<i>upunia</i>	<i>bar hisi</i>	40
<i>monreā</i>	<i>bar hisi geleā</i>	50
<i>turūia</i>	<i>api hisi</i>	60
<i>ēa</i>	<i>api hisi geleā</i>	70
<i>irilia</i>	<i>upun hisi</i>	80
<i>arēa</i>	<i>upun hisi geleā</i>	90
<i>geleā</i>				

<i>gel miad'</i> 11	<i>monre hisi, or sau, sai, mid' sai,</i>		
<i>gel baria</i> 12	<i>mod'sai</i> 100
<i>gel apia</i> 13	<i>mod' sai miad'</i> 101
<i>gel upunia</i> 14	<i>mod' sai baria</i> 102
<i>gel monrea</i> 15	<i>mod' sai gelea</i> 110
<i>gel turuia</i> 16	<i>mod' sai mod' hisi, or turui hisi</i>		120
<i>gel ea</i> 17	<i>bar sai</i> 200
<i>gel irilia</i> 18	<i>api sai</i> 300
<i>gel area</i> 19	<i>upun sai</i> 400
<i>hisi, isi, mid' hisi, or mod' hisi</i>		20	<i>gel sai, or mid' hazar, mod' hajar</i>		1000
<i>mid' hisi miad'</i> 21	<i>mod' hajar mod' sai gel baria</i>		1112
<i>mid' hisi baria</i> 22	<i>mod' hajar iril sai upun hisi</i>		
			<i>gel upunia</i> 1894

The last vowel of *apia*, *monrea*, *turuia*, *ea*, and *area* is always dropped when they are placed before the higher numbers—*hisi*, *sai*, *hajar*. *Baria*, *upunia*, *irilia*, *gelea* drop the two last vowels before those higher numbers.

The same rule is followed whenever any of the ten first Numerals is placed before (a) words denoting measures of any kind, (b) the words *horo* (man), *orá* (house), *bó* (head), used as appositions in enumerations.

In enumerating the families of a village the word *orá* (house) is used as apposition in the same manner.

The word *bó* (head) is similarly used in enumerations of cattle.

N.B.—The words *horo*, *orá*, *bó*, when thus used as appositions, do not take the Dual or Plural Suffixes.

Bar gaudi, two leagues; *api tewa*, three tawas (a grain measure); *gel muka*, ten yards; *upun ghanta*, four hours; *e taka*, seven rupees; *amá chinmin honko menakoa?* *Korá-honko api horo*, *kuři honko bar horo*,—How many children have you? Three sons and two daughters. *No hature gel api orá Mundako*, *oro are orá Uraonko menakoa*, or *No hature Mundako gel api orá*, *oro Uranko are orá menakoa*,—In this village there are 13 Munda families and 9 Uraon families. *Kerako tunui bó uriko upun bó menakoa*,—There are six buffaloes and four bullocks.

II.—DISTRIBUTIVE NUMERALS.

Distributive Numerals are formed by the reduplication of the Simple Cardinal Numerals.

In the Compound Numbers this reduplication takes place only in the first Numeral of the Compound.

Sometimes even Compound Cardinal Numerals are used as Distributives without any change whatsoever—

<i>mi-miāḍ'</i> , or <i>mi-miāḍ'</i> ,	one each.	<i>ge-gel miāḍ'</i> ,	eleven each.
<i>ba-barīa</i> ,	two „	<i>ge-gel barīa</i> ,	twelve „
<i>ap-apīz</i> ,	three „	<i>ge-gel apīa</i> ,	thirteen „
<i>up-upunīa</i> ,	four „	<i>ge-gel monṛea</i> ,	fifteen „
<i>moṛs-monṛea</i>	five „	<i>hi-hīsi</i> or <i>mo-mod' hīsi</i> ,	twenty „
<i>tu-turūtā</i> ,	six „	<i>hi-hīsi miāḍ'</i> ,	twenty-one „
<i>e-ea</i> ,	seven „	<i>ba-bar hīsi</i> ,	forty „
<i>ir-irīlīa</i> ,	eight „	<i>mon-monṛe hīsi</i> ,	or
<i>ar-arē</i> ,	nine „	<i>sa-sai</i> ,	a hundred „
<i>ge-gelez</i> ,	ten „	<i>ba-bar sai</i> ,	two hundred „
		<i>ha-hajar</i> ,	a thousand „

The forms given above are used adjectively.

When it is required to use Distributive Numerals adverbially, the Postposition *te*, as significative of manner, is suffixed to them—

<i>mimiāḍ' te</i> , <i>mi-miāḍ' te</i>	one by one.	<i>tuturiate</i> ,	six by six.
<i>babariate</i> , <i>babarte</i> ,	two by two.	<i>eeate</i> ,	seven by seven.
<i>apapiate</i> ,	three by three.	<i>iririliate</i> ,	eight by eight.
<i>upupuniate</i> ,	four by four.	<i>arareate</i> ,	nine by nine.
<i>monmonṛeate</i> ,	five by five.	<i>gegeleate</i> ,	ten by ten.

Mimiāḍ' baḥar paisa omakom,—Give them two pice each. *Daruko apapiate* roakana,—The trees are planted three by three, three in a row. *Paltanko tuturiate* ko sesena,—The soldiers march six by six, six abreast.

REMARK.—When there is question of human beings, the apposition *hoṛo* often occurs where we would expect a Distributive Adverb only. In this case several different constructions may be used—

1. *Hoṛo* is repeated and preceded each time by the Cardinal Numeral; the second time *hoṛo* takes the suffix *te*, *v.gr.*—

Bar hoṛo bar hoṛote senope, [walk two by two.

2. *Hoṛo* preceded by a Distributive Numeral takes the suffix *te*, *v.gr.*—

Monmonṛe hoṛote senope, walk five by five.

3. In either of the two constructions given above *hoṛo* generally drops the suffix *te* when the Predicate is by itself alone expressive of manner or arrangement, *v.gr.*, *panti*, abreast—

Upun hoṛo upun hoṛo pantinpe, arrange yourselves into ranks of four and four—or *Upupun hoṛo* pantinpe;

The same rule is observed when such words as *panti* are used, not transitively, but adverbially to specify some other Predicate. Then those words take the suffix *te*—

Moṛe hoṛo moṛe hoṛo pantiteko aiarka, let them advance five by five.

III.—ORDINAL NUMERALS.

There are only two forms in common use, viz., *sida*, the first, and *etá*, the second.

The Cardinal Numerals from three upwards are used with the function of Ordinals. This deficiency of Ordinal forms ought to give rise to many an ambiguous proposition when there is question of inanimate objects, because Nouns denoting inanimate objects generally take no Plural Suffix. Thus *api daru* may mean three trees and it may mean the third tree. This inconvenience, however, has never troubled the Mundas so far as to urge them to coin a compound that would do away with the ambiguity. They prefer to make themselves understood either by pointing out the object in question, or by having recourse to some circumlocution.

Thus to say, *cut the fourth tree*, they will say *api daru aiar-red máeme*; *literally*, cut that one (which is) before the three trees.

Call the sixth boy,—*Monre korakoá aiar-rentí ráime*, i.e., call that one who is before the five boys.

Or they will say *apia daru bageked'te miad' máeme*, i.e., leaving or having left three trees cut one.

To say, *cut down the four first trees*, they will point at the tree first and say: *En apia ló upunia daru máeme*; *literally*, together with those three, cut four trees.

When the objects in question cannot thus be pointed out materially, then they point them out either by means of a statement, or more generally by means of a plain question; thus:

Han hora genare gelbaria uli daru roakana, chi ka? He mar! apia bageked'te miad' máepe,—Along yonder road there are planted 12 mango trees, is it not so? Very well, leaving three (i.e., the three first ones) cut down one (i.e., the fourth one).

Han hora genare gelbaria daru roakana chi ka? He mar! apialó upinia máepe,—Are there along yonder road twelve trees or not? All right! together with three (i.e., the three first) cut four trees, i.e., cut the four first ones.

IV.—PROPORTIONAL NUMERALS

Proportional Numerals are formed by suffixing *sá*, and in some districts *duang* or *duan* to the Cardinal Numerals.

The numbers from 2 to 10 inclusively drop the last or the two last vowels as indicated above under I (page 65)—

<i>mid'sá, misá, mosá</i>	or	<i>mid'duang</i>	... once.
<i>barsá</i>	"	<i>barduang</i>	... twice.
<i>apisá</i>	"	<i>apiduang</i>	... thrice, three times.
<i>upunsá</i>	"	<i>upunduang</i>	... four times.
<i>monresá</i>	"	<i>monreduang</i>	... five times.
<i>turuisá</i>	"	<i>turuiduang</i>	... six times.
<i>ēsá</i>	"	<i>ēduang</i>	... seven times.
<i>irilsá</i>	"	<i>irilduang</i>	... eight times.
<i>aresá</i>	"	<i>areduang</i>	... nine times.
<i>gelsá</i>	"	<i>gelduang</i>	... ten times.
<i>gelmid'sá</i>	"	<i>gelmid'duang</i>	... eleven times.
<i>mid'hisisá</i>	"	<i>mid'hisiduang</i>	... twenty times.
<i>modsaisá</i>	"	<i>mod'saiduang</i>	... a hundred times.

Approximations are expressed by juxtaposing two numbers without any conjunction, whenever the approximation is close to the exact number.

In Proportional Numerals the second only takes the suffix—*sá* *Monre turui hoŋo*, 5 or 6 men; *Api upunsá*, 3 or 4 times.

Doubtful numbers are expressed by suffixing *leka* to either the Cardinal or the Proportional Numerals.

Sometimes two numbers are juxtaposed and the second one takes the suffix *leka*.

Mod'hisi leka, about twenty. *Gelsáleka*, about ten times.

When these doubtful Numerals stand before a Noun the suffix *leka* is sometimes added to the Noun. But this position of *leka* seems to be anomalous—

Gelbaria daruleka or *gelbarialeka* daru máeme,—Cut down about twelve trees

When, in approximations, two or three multiples of 20, 100 or 1,000 are juxtaposed, the numbers *hisi*, *sai*, *hajar* are used only once, i.e., after the second or third multiplicand—

Bar api hisi leka, about 40 or 60. *Api upun saisá leka*, about 3 or 4 hundred times.

In the shape of *Fractional Numerals* there exists only the word *tala* or *tara*, meaning (1) the middle, the centre; (2) to halve, to divide into two equal parts; (3) half.

The requirements of their limited commercial transactions are sufficiently served by some special words denoting various fractions of the rupee or of some measures in ordinary use: *adeli*, an eight-anna piece; *ganda*, one anna, *sala*, 40 seers (of grain); *kandi*, 20 seers (of grain), etc.

If it be absolutely required to designate a fraction explicitly, the Mundas have recourse to some circumlocution, *v.gr.*—

Cut off two-thirds,—*Apia hatingete baria hating* máeme (of three parts, cut off two).

The first four Mundari Numerals occur in Mon, Cambodian Anamese and at least three other languages. Two, three, and four are monosyllables, viz., *baria*, two, is *bä* in Mon and *bar* in the others. *Apia*, three, appears as *pe* in three of these, in the others as *peh*, *pey* for *peng*.

Mon has *m'son* for *monre*. In the other languages the Numeral *five* has no apparent resemblance to *monrea*.

Turuia, six, occurs as *t'rou* in Mon and as *treon* and *totron* in two others. All the remaining Numerals are apparently quite different from the Mundari forms.

Sá ant tá are interchangeable in Mundari. Is it a mere accidental coincidence that Burjatic forms Iterative Numerals by suffixing *tá* to the Cardinal Numerals even as Mundari suffixes *sí* for the same purpose?

In the same language Distributive Numerals are formed by adding the Instrumental Suffix to the repeated Cardinal Number just as in Mundari.

In Cambojan and Malay *isi* means *all*, and is used as one of the Plural Suffixes. If the Mundari *hisi* or *isi*, twenty, can be referred to this root, it would confirm the conjecture that this Numeral, which is the only distinct form the Mundas possess beyond *ten* was really intended to convey the idea of the great total of what probably formed their basis of counting, viz., the fingers *plus* the toes. The root *man*, *mun* or *bin*, meaning 100 in Wigur, 1,000 in Osmanli, 10,000 in Chinese, is similarly used to denote multitude, and hence means also *all*.

II.--WORDS USED

I.—ADVERBS

1. Most Adverbs of Place are formed by suffixing the Postpositions Interrogative Demonstratives. *Sá* is used as frequently as *tá* in these

<i>nere</i>	... here	<i>enre</i>	...
<i>netáre</i>	...	<i>entáre</i>	... }
<i>nesáre</i>	... } here about, or somewhere here	<i>ensáre</i>	... }
<i>nete</i>	... hither.	<i>ente</i>	...
<i>netáte</i>	...	<i>entáte</i>	... }
<i>nesáte</i>	... } this way, this direction.	<i>ensáte</i>	... }
<i>neute</i>	... hence.	<i>enate</i>	... }
		<i>enete</i>	... }
<i>netáate</i>	...	<i>entáate</i>	... }
<i>netáete</i>	... } from this side, from this direc-	<i>entáete</i>	... }
<i>nesáate</i>	... } tion.	<i>ensáate</i>	... }
<i>nesáete</i>	...	<i>ensáete</i>	... }
<i>netá</i>	... } used in vague indications,	<i>entá</i>	... }
<i>nesá</i>	... } denoting both rest and motion.	<i>ensá</i>	... }
<i>okore ?</i>	... where ?	<i>jetare</i>	...
<i>okotáre</i>	...	<i>jetatáre</i>	... }
<i>okosáre</i>	... } whereabouts ?	<i>jetasáre</i>	... }
<i>okote</i>	... whither ?	<i>jetate</i>	...
<i>okotáte</i>	... what way ?	<i>jetatáte</i>	... }
<i>okosáte</i>	... what direction ?	<i>jetasáte</i>	... }
<i>okoate</i>	... whence ?	<i>jetaete</i>	...
<i>okotáate</i>	... { from what side	<i>jetáate</i>	... }
<i>etc.</i>	... { or direction ?	<i>etc.</i>	...
<i>sobentáre</i>	... } everywhere.	<i>sobentáte</i>	... }
<i>sobensáre</i>	...	<i>sobensáte</i>	... }

REMARK.—The forms *nare*, here ; *nate*, hither, occur occasionally instead of *nere* and *nete*. the Pronominal forms—*nea-re*, in this one ; *nea-te*, to this one.

2. A certain number of Compound Postpositions are used as are cut away from all connection with Nouns or Pronouns, and are used

<i>chetanre</i>	... above.	<i>talare</i>	...
<i>sirmare</i>	... above.	<i>japare</i>	...
<i>rachare</i>	... outside.	<i>bitarre</i>	...
<i>paromre</i>	... across.	<i>doiare</i>	...
<i>aiarre</i>	... ahead.	<i>taiomre</i>	...

To these may be added—

ADVERBIALLY.

OF PLACE.

re, táre, te, táte, ate, ete, táate, táete to the Definite, Indefinite, and compounds—

there.	<i>hanre</i>	... yonder.
somewhere, about there.	<i>hantáre</i>	... } somewhere yonder.
thither.	<i>hansáre</i>	... }
that way, or that direction.	<i>hante</i>	... yonder.
thence.	<i>hantáte</i>	... } that way yonder to
	<i>hansáte</i>	... } that side yonder.
	<i>hanate</i>	... } from yonder side.
	<i>hanete</i>	... }
from somewhere there, from that side.	<i>hantáate</i>	... } from somewhere
	<i>hantáete</i>	... }
	<i>hansáate</i>	... } yonder.
	<i>hansáete</i>	... }
used like <i>netá</i> .	<i>hantá</i>	... } used like <i>netá</i> .
somewhere.	<i>hansá</i>	... }
somewhere about.	<i>jare</i>	... anywhere at all.
some way.	<i>játáre</i>	... } anywhere about.
in some direction or another.	<i>jasáre</i>	... }
from somewhere.	<i>jate</i>	... any way.
from some direction or another.	<i>játáte</i>	... } in any direction at all.
	<i>jasáte</i>	... }
	<i>jaete</i>	... from anywhere.
	<i>játáate,</i>	... } from any side at all.
	etc.	... } from whatever side.
in every direction.	<i>sobentáete</i>	... }
	<i>sobensáete</i>	... } from everywhere.

These seem to be the stronger equivalents of the forms *nere* and *nete*, and not contractions of

Adverbs of Place without undergoing any change whatever, *i.e.*, they simply to modify Transitive or Intransitive Predicates—

in the middle.	<i>subare</i>	... below, underneath.
close by, near.	<i>latarre</i>	... below, underneath.
inside.	<i>danangre</i>	... behind (hidden).
behir. l.	<i>kundamre</i>	... behind (the house).
behind.		

Nanre, near; *sanginre*, far.

All the above take the Suffixes *te* or *ate*, *ete* when the Predicate to be

<i>chetante</i>	... upwards.	<i>talate</i>	...
<i>chetanate</i>	... } from above.	<i>talaete</i>	...
etc.		etc.	...
<i>sanginte</i>	... from far away.	<i>sanginate</i>	...

The same words take the Suffixes *täre* (*säre*), *täte* (*säte*), *tüate* or denote either *rest within* a vaguely defined area, or *motion to* or *from*

Hence another triple

<i>chetantäre</i>	... somewhere above.	<i>talatäre</i>	...
<i>chetantäte</i>	... somewhere upwards.	<i>talatäte</i>	...
<i>chetantüate</i>	... } from somewhere above.	<i>talatüate</i>	...
etc.		etc.	...

3. All the compounds under No. 2 may be rendered more precise

<i>nechetanre</i>	... above here.	<i>enchetanre</i>	...
<i>nechetantäre</i>	... above here somewhere.	<i>enchetantäre</i>	...
<i>nechetante</i>	... up here.	<i>enchetante</i>	...
<i>nechetantäte</i>	... up here somewhere.	<i>enchetantäte</i>	...
etc.		etc.	

4. *Köre* and *köte* are added (1) to *ne*, *en*, *han*; (2) to *netá* (*nesá*) the Postpositions *chetan*, etc. enumerated above under No. 2, and to designate a place or to indicate a limit.

The compounds thus obtained with *köre* specify Predicates denoting indicate the place of rest or the limit or terminus of a motion vaguely

(1) <i>neköre</i>	... somewhere here.	(3 & 4) <i>jetaköre</i>	...
(2) <i>netáköre</i>	... somewhere about here.	<i>jetaköte</i>	...
<i>neköte</i>	... about up to this point.	<i>jataköte</i>	...
<i>netáköte</i>	... more or less up to this place.	<i>chetanköre</i>	...
etc.		etc.	

NOTE.—The syllable *kö* in *köre*, *köte* seems to be but the Indefinite Demonstrative *oö*

modified by them denotes *motion to* or *from* a place. Hence—

to the middle.	<i>subate</i>	... downwards.
from the middle.	<i>subaete</i> , etc.	... from below.
from afar.	<i>nanrete</i>	... near to (a place), close by.

táete (*sáate* or *sdete*) when the Predicates to be modified by them some less well-determined point of space, a vaguely indicated direction, set of Adverbs of Place—

somewhere in the middle.	<i>subatáre</i>	... somewhere below.
somewhere to the middle.	<i>subatáte</i>	... somewhere downwards.
somewhere from the middle.	<i>subatáte</i> etc.	... from somewhere below.

by placing the Definite Demonstratives *ne*, *en*, *han* before them—

above there.	<i>hanchetanre</i>	... above yonder.
above there somewhere.	<i>hanchetantáre</i>	above yonder somewhere.
up there.	<i>hanchetante</i>	... up yonder.
up there somewhere.	<i>hanchetantáte</i> etc.	... up yonder somewhere.

entá (*ensá*), *hantá* (*hansá*); (3) to *jetá*, *jatá*, *sobentá* (*sobensá*); (4) to compounds of the same with *tá* (*sá*); (5) to Nouns there and then used

rest; those with *kôte* modify Predicates denoting *motion to*. They or approximately, not very exactly—

somewhere about.	(5) <i>Ranchiköre</i>	... somewhere in Ranchi.
to some point or place.	<i>Ranchitáköre</i>	... somewhere about Ranchi.
to any place at all.	<i>muküribókôte</i>	... about knee-deep; <i>literally</i> about up to the head of the knee.
somewhere above. etc.		

some.

It may be remarked here that the Adverbs of Place seem to clearly bear out the statement made in the Introduction that distinct parts of speech as such, *i.e.*, with permanent characteristics and with limited functions of their own, have not as yet been evolved in Mundari—

1st. We here meet with a set of words which, without undergoing any change, are used indifferently both as Postpositions and as Adverbs of Place. Such are the compounds *chetanre*, etc., enumerated under No. 2.

2nd.—These same compounds may, again without undergoing any change of form, be used as Transitive or Intransitive Predicates. For this it suffices to suffix to them a Pronominal Subject and a Copula, and, if need be, an appropriate Tense-suffix.

Pred.	Subj.	Cop.	Pred.	Subj.	Cop.
<i>Chetanre-ko-a</i>	—they	are above.	<i>Chetante-ko-a</i>	—They	go above.
Pred	Subj.	Tense Cop.			
<i>Aiante</i>	--	<i>ko</i>	--	<i>jan</i>	--
		<i>a</i>			—They went ahead.

The compounds under No. 1 are similarly used as Intransitive Predicates, *v. gr.*—

Okore-ko-a?—Where are they? *Okote-ko-jan-a?*—Where did they go? *Okote-m-tan-a?*—Whither dost thou go now?—*Hante-le-a*, We shall go to that place yonder.

3rd.—It has been stated in the chapter on Postpositions that *re*, *te*, *ete*, etc., are suffixed to Nouns and Pronouns to perform the functions which our Prepositions perform in connection with Nouns and Pronouns.

But here we see those same Postpositions suffixed to the unaltered Demonstrative roots—*ne*, *en*, *han*. Now, in the preceding chapters we have met these Demonstratives with an Adjective function only. In this Adjective function they always precede the Noun or Pronoun they qualify, as in *ne horo*,—this man; *en horo*,—that man; *handaru*,—yonder tree: or in *han-i*,—yonder one; *han-king*,—those two yonder; *han-ko*,—those yonder. Here those same roots no longer qualify any Noun or Pronoun: they stand quite independently, and they take the suffixes *re*, *te*, *ete*, etc., in the manner and meaning in which these suffixes are attached to Nouns and Pronouns.

We may therefore say that the Demonstratives *ne*, *en*, *han* perform the functions of Nouns in the Adverbial compounds; that they are used Substantively, not Adjectively; they are by themselves alone equivalent to the English *Noun + Demonstrative*—this thing, this place

ne-re, in *the* (this place). The same remark applies to the words *chetan*, *aiar*, etc. (see No. 2): hence the compounds *chetan-re*, *aiar-re*, etc., literally mean—in *the* above, in *the* ahead, etc.

To sum up—

- (1) We have first met the Demonstratives *ne*, *en*, *han* with a distinctively *Adjective function*.
- (2) Here we find the same unaltered forms with a *Substantive function* for the purpose of forming *Adverbial compounds*.
- (3) The compounds thus obtained are not restricted to their *Adverbial functions*; they may without undergoing any change of form assume an *Intransitive function*.

Again—

- (1) We have met the words *chetan*, *aiar*, etc., with a *Transitive* or an *Intransitive function*; some such as *sirma tala*, with both a *Substantive* and a *Transitive* or *Intransitive function*.
- (2) Here we find the same words assuming a *Substantive function* for the purpose of forming *Adverbial compounds* or *Postpositions*.
- (3) The compounds thus obtained are not restricted to their *Adverbial function*; they may be used with a *Transitive* or *Intransitive function*.
- (4) These same compounds assume a *Substantive function* in the complex Adverbs—*ne chetanre*, *en chetanre*, etc., because in these forms *chetanre*, etc., are preceded by the Demonstratives *ne*, *en*, *han* used *Adjectively*, i.e., as qualificative to a Noun.

II.—ADVERBS OF QUANTITY.

1. A certain number of Indefinite Demonstratives are used adverbially without undergoing any change in form—

<i>isu</i> , much.	<i>erage</i> , very much.	<i>betekan</i> , very much.
<i>isupurá</i> , very much.	<i>mermer</i> , very much.	<i>huring</i> , little.
<i>purá</i> , much.	<i>timba</i> , very much.	<i>huring huring</i> , very little.

Ge is very frequently suffixed to the above as emphatic enclitic.

Era seems never to be used without the suffix *ge*.

2. The Definite and Interrogative Demonstratives in which the quantitative *min* occurs are never used Adverbially without the suffix

ang or *ung*. The change of *a* into *u* seems to be caused by the vowel *i*. The forms in *ung* are less frequent than those in *ang*—

chiminang,	} how much ?	niminang,	} this much.
chiminung,		niminung,	
iminang,	} that much.	haminang,	} as much as that yonder.
iminung,		haminung,	

REMARK.—The compounds *iminang*, *niminang*, and *haminang* are also used as Correlative Adverbs.

Paulus *iminangko* oldaria,—They can write *as much* or *as well* as Paul. Ako *iminangdo* kaing sendaria,—I cannot walk *as well* or *as far* as they can.

3. The suffixes *sá* or *duang* are added to the Adverbs under No. 2, and to *isu*, *purá*, *isupurá*, *huring*, and *huring huring* to form Comparative Adverbs of Quantity.

Isusá,—many times. *Chiminangsá*,—how many times ? *iminangsá*,—as often as that. The forms *iminangsá*, *niminangsá*, and *haminangsá* are also used as Correlatives.

4. *Leka*, suffixed to the compounds under No. 1, and to *isu*, *purá*, *huring*, *huring huring*, *isupurá* transforms them into approximate Adverbs of Quantity—

<i>chiminangleka</i> , about how much ?	<i>niminangleka</i> , about this much.
<i>iminangleka</i> , about this much.	<i>haminangleka</i> , about as much as that yonder.
<i>isuleka</i> , pretty much.	<i>puráleka</i> , pretty much.
<i>isupuraleka</i> , very much.	<i>huringleka</i> , a little, rather little.
<i>huring huringleka</i> , very very little.	

REMARK.—*Iminangleka*, *niminangleka*, *haminangleka* are used also as Correlative Adverbs.

Paulus *iminanglekaing* hudumadaria,—I can throw *about as far* as Paul.

III.—ADVERBS OF MANNER.

1. The following are used adverbially without taking any suffix :—

<i>isu</i> (asu), very.	<i>mer mer</i> , very intensely.
<i>erage</i> , very.	<i>kented'</i> , intensely, violently.
<i>bodege</i> , quickly, at once !	<i>betekan</i> , very much.
<i>sekerage</i> , quickly.	<i>birang</i> , } only, alone.
<i>rokage</i> , suddenly.	<i>birage</i> , }
<i>kaiom</i> , unexpectedly.	<i>eskar</i> , <i>eskarge</i> , only.
<i>upaige</i> , in vain, without rhyme or reason, unprofitably.	
<i>samage</i> , in vain, without rhyme or reason, for nothing, without profit, without clothes, with an empty stomach, without having eaten.	

2. The Postposition *te* is sometimes used to denote manner. With this function it is suffixed to some of the words under No. 1 as well as to some others, especially Intransitive Predicates, to form Adverbs of Manner.

manṛite, slowly, softly (of sound and motion).

manṛi manṛite, very slowly, very softly.

mid'te (*misate*), together.

hambalte, difficulty.

berelte, raw (not boiled).

landate, laughingly.

kaklate, quite loud (shoutingly).

eklatante, tremblingly (being trembling).

sukute, gladly, with joy.

borote, timidly, with fear.

sojete, straight, in a straight line.

sekerate, quickly.

bodete, quickly.

andagate, suddenly.

rabalte, easily.

petote, raw (green, unripe).

rātante, cryingly, with tears.

landiate, lazily (*lit.*, idlingly).

rasikate, gladly, joyfully.

ka-borote, fearlessly.

gandite,

gandete, } crookedly.

REMARK.—Here, again, we have Numerals like *mid'*, *misā*, Intransitive and Transitive Predicates like *bode*, *sekerā*, *kakla*, *boro*, etc., and even Definite Present Tenses like *rātan*, *eklatan*, and Qualitatives like *hambal*, *rabal*, *peto*, *berel*, assuming a Substantive function and taking the suffix *te*.

If it be admitted that these words have a Substantive function in the compounds enumerated here, then it is readily understood how the suffix *te* has come to denote manner, just as, *v. gr.*, the English termination *ly*, which latter has no longer any meaning if taken by itself alone; for then these compounds must be considered as a kind of Instrumental Case. Thus *mid'te* means, literally, with unity. *Misate*, with ensemble—

bodete, with celerity.

sekerate „ „

eklatante, with actual trembling.

kaklate, with shouting.

landiate, with laziness.

rātante, with actual weeping

3. A very ordinary mode of forming Adverbs and Adverbial phrases of Manner, consists in suffixing *leka* or *lekate*: (1) to the Definite, Indefinite and Interrogative Demonstratives; (2) to Nouns and Pronouns; (3) to Adverbs of Time; (4) to Active and Passive Predicates with or without their Subjects or Objects—

(1) *chileka* (*chilekate*), how? in what way?

neleka (*nelekate*),
neka (*nekate*), } in this way.

hanleka (*hanlekate*),
hanka (*hankate*), } in the same manner as that yonder.

okoleka (*okolekate*), like what?

enleka (*enlekate*),
enka (*enkate*), } in that manner.

juleka (*julekate*), in any manner, any way at all.

jetaleka (*jetalekate*), in some manner.

Tab, dab, or ba, quickly, fast; *chaba*, completely; *Ruar* or *rura*, again. *Senótab*, to go fast. *Oluuar*, to rewrite, to write over again. *Bairuar* or *bairura*, to repair. *Olchaba*, to write out completely, to finish off a writing. *Jomchaba*, to eat up completely, to finish off the whole food set before one.

Of the above, *chaba*, *ruar* or *rura* are also used as independent Predicates; *chaba* meaning to complete some work, *ruar* or *rura* meaning to return, to come back.

OBSERVATION.—The use of Adverbs is more restricted in Mundari than in our languages, because where we use a Verb with an Adverb, they often use the word corresponding to our Adverb with a transitive or intransitive function.

Beginners, however, must beware of an indiscriminate use of this method; for in a certain number of cases the use of a Predicate with an Adverb is the more ordinary construction, whereas in other cases Adverbs alone are used transitively or intransitively in their original meaning. Thus, *v. gr.*, *liud'* means crooked. *Enale liud'a* means that we call crooked. *Liud'me*, make it crooked. Practice is the only safe guide in this matter.

IV.—ADVERBS OF TIME.

<i>chimtang</i> ?	...	} When ? At what time ?	<i>munure</i>	...	In the beginning, at first.
<i>chimta</i> ?	...		<i>tundure</i>	...	In the end, at the end.
<i>chiula</i> ?	...		<i>misá misá</i>	...	} Sometimes, now and again.
<i>ná</i>	...	When ? What day ?	<i>mosá mosá</i>	...	
<i>imtang</i>	...	Now.	<i>isusá, purasá</i>	...	Often, frequently.
<i>ne imtang</i>	...	Then.	<i>isupurasá</i>	...	Very often.
<i>nimtang</i>	...	} Just a moment ago.	<i>isuduang, pura- duang.</i>	...	Often.
<i>enimtang</i>	...		<i>isupuraduang</i>	...	Very often.
<i>hanimtang</i>	...	Just a moment before that.	<i>tising, ising</i>	...	To-day.
<i>jetaimtang</i>	...	Just a moment before that (i. e., an event long since past).	<i>hola</i>	...	Yesterday.
<i>jaimtang</i>	...	At some time.	<i>gapa</i>	...	To-morrow.
<i>jetaimtangka</i>	...	At any time, at any moment.	<i>holátère</i>	...	The day before yesterday.
<i>jaimtangoka</i>	...	At no time, never.	<i>gapadanang</i>	...	} The day after to-morrow.
<i>jaimtangoka</i>	...	Never, at no time whatever.	<i>meang</i>	...	
<i>janla</i>	...	Any day.	<i>tisingapa</i>	...	} Now-a-days.
<i>chiulaoka</i>	...	Never.	<i>nimir</i>	...	
<i>janao</i>	...	Always.	<i>honder</i>	...	Some days ago.
<i>jonom jonom</i>	...	Always.	<i>honder honder</i>	...	Long ago.
<i>ianaoka</i>	...	Never.	<i>han honder</i>	...	That time, long ago.
<i>neskan</i>	...	This time.	<i>musing, musing kulang.</i>	...	Once upon a time, some day.
<i>naike</i>	...	} After a while, shortly !	<i>enbeter, enbetera...</i>	...	} At that time.
<i>nge</i>	...		<i>enbeterang</i>	...	
<i>garikad're</i>	...		<i>singsatub'</i>	...	The whole day long.
<i>lika</i>	...	Just a moment !	<i>ma, maha</i>	...	Last year.
<i>enang</i>	...	A while ago.	<i>kalom, kalomre</i>	...	} After one year, next year.
<i>sida, sidare</i>	...	} Before, sooner, first, at first.	<i>kalomkore</i>	...	
<i>sidate</i>	...		<i>dinaki</i>	...	} Daily.
<i>aiar, aiur, aiarre</i>	...	Before, sooner.	<i>dinaki dinaki</i>	...	
<i>taiom, taiomre</i>	...	} Afterwards, later, later on.	<i>angoma, angomutid.</i>	...	Every day, daily.
<i>taiomte, taiomkote</i>	...		<i>sirma sirma</i>	...	Every year, yearly.
<i>pofton re</i>	...	In the very beginning.	<i>mosat sirma</i>	...	} Two years ago.
			<i>misat sirma</i>	...	

Auri after a while, not yet, before. (For construction see Future, page 137)

To these may be added a list of words and phrases used by the Mundas to designate the different parts or hours of the day. Besides the natural divisions, such as the different positions of the sun, the Mundas have adopted some others taken from their daily work—

Simko auri ráre, long before daybreak; *literally*, before the cocks crow.

Sida simko ráre, a little before daybreak; *literally*, when the cocks crow first.

Angóre, angódipli, at dawn.

Singi turó, singi turóre; *Singiturtanre*, at sunrise.

Aparana dipli, about 8 A.M.; *literally*, at yoking time, when oxen are yoked to the plough.

Landia tikin, about 10 A.M.; *literally*, lazy noon, *i.e.*, when lazy people leave their work.

Tikin, } at 12 o'clock; *literally* { Noon.
Muli tikin } Straight noon, exact noon.

Hare singi, about 2 P.M.; *literally*, at the crooked sun, when the sun is oblique.

Tara singi, about 4 P.M.; *literally*, when the sun stands midway between noon and sunset.

Etá sanj, afternoon, *i.e.*, the other half-day.

Basang dá dipli, between 4 and 5 P.M.; *literally*, at water-fetching time, *i.e.*, when women go to get water for the evening meal.

Uří ader dipli, between 5 and 6 P.M.; *literally*, when it is time to drive the cattle home.

Singi hasur, }
Singi dubui, } at sunset.

Mandi jom dipli, supper time, *i.e.*, after sunset.

Aiub', aiub're, evening, in the evening.

Tala nida, }
Tala nidare, } at midnight.

Enangá, in to-day's forenoon.

Nasá, this afternoon.

Giti dipli, bedtime, time to lie down.

Nida, nidare, night, at night.

Mid'sanj, }
Mod'sanj, } half a working day, half of the full number of working hours.

VII.—CONJUNCTIONS.

1st.—The various forms of the Indefinite Demonstrative *oro* are used as Conjunctions without taking any suffix.

They stand chiefly as a link between words in enumerations. They are less frequently used by the Mundas to connect propositions with each other—

Ad', adó, oró, onó, ondo = and.

Munda *oró* pahanking hijúlena,—The village-chief and the sacrificer have come; *literally*, the village-chief + the sacrificer have come.

2nd.—The ordinary Co-ordinative Conjunctions connecting propositions with each other are formed by suffixing *te* to the Definite Demonstrative *en* or to the Pronoun *ena*.

It will be seen further on (page 208) that *te* is often suffixed to the Past Tense to denote a simple priority of one action over another. Here in the Compounds *ente*, *enate*, *te* has evidently the same function. Hence these Compounds may very accurately be rendered into English by—*that being so*, or *that being done*, or *that being said*, i.e., *thereupon*, and *then*.

Ente (*entedo*); *enate* (*enatedo*); *enad'* (*enad'do*); *ente enad'*,—and then, thereupon.

N.B.—The form *enad'* is most likely a contraction of *enatedo*. If to this, again, *do* be added by a false analogy, the form *enad'do* is obtained.

3rd.—The Causal Conjunctions are obtained by suffixing *mente* to the Demonstrative Pronouns *nea* or *ena*—

Neamente for this; *enamente*, for that, therefore.

N.B.—*Men* means to say; *mente* literally means by saying, saying. (For the various transferred significations of this form, page 61.)

REMARK.—*Do* is generally suffixed to *neamente*, *enamente* when these Conjunctions are followed by the Negative Particle *ka*, as *neamentedo ka*, not indeed for this reason; *enamentedo ka*, not indeed for that reason.

4th.—Conditional Conjunctions are formed by suffixing *re* either to *en*, *ena* or to the Quantitative *imin* (that much).

It has been stated that *re* is suffixed to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates to form Compounds equivalent to our Conditional clauses and Temporal clauses.

In the Compounds *enre*, *enare*, *iminre*, it occurs in the same function: hence these Compounds are correctly rendered into English, thus: *enre*, *during that*, *in the meanwhile*; also, *if that be so*; *enare*, *if*, or *in case that be so*.

The Adverb *o*, too, also, even, is always suffixed to *iminre* and often to *enre*—

<i>Enre</i> {	in the meanwhile.	<i>Enreo</i> , even if, even then.
	notwithstanding.	<i>Iminreo</i> , even then notwithstanding ; <i>literally</i> , even if it be so much.

Barsáaing rákia *iminreo* kae hijútana,—I called him twice, notwithstanding that he does not come.

REMARK.—In Negative Conditional propositions no Conjunction is used, but *re* is suffixed to the Predicate.

If you do *not* come,—kam hijú-*re*. *If* he had *not* been sick,—kae hasulen-*re*. *Literally*, In thy not coming. In his not having been sick.

5th.—*Disjunctive Conjunctions* are formed by suffixing *re* to *ka* (not) or to *ban* (*banó*, not to be)—

Kare (*karedo*), or else, or if not ; (either)..... or.
Banre (*banredo*), „ „ ; „ „

Merom tolime *karedoe* nira,—Tie the goat or else it will run away.

Karedo, *banredo* may also stand after the Predicate—

Chatu nere alom dota, rapudóa *karedo*,—Don't place the waterpot here or else it will be smashed.

Only one Conjunction is used in Disjunctive sentences : there is no special word corresponding to *either* in the English Compound Disjunctive *either*.....or.

Nere *orá* saurite *karedo* kechoteko dabea,—Here they cover the houses *either* with straw *or* with tiles.

OBSERVATION.—Mundas pretty often merely juxtapose words and even propositions where we would use conjunctions.

In narratives, especially in rehearsing their scanty stock of popular stories, the Conjunctions *ente*, *enate*, *entedo*, *enatedo*, *enad*, *enad'do* are repeated with a most tedious profusion.

Honang is used in connection with Indicative Mood-forms to express that something would be done, would have been done, etc., if a certain condition were fulfilled. (See pages 204 and 205.)

AFFIRMATIVE, NEGATIVE, AND DUBITATIVE PARTICLES.

<i>Ho, hege,</i>	} yes.	<i>kagedo,</i>	} certainly not, by no means.
<i>ea,</i>		<i>kaoró,</i>	
<i>he oró,</i>		<i>idu,</i>	perhaps.
<i>he derang,</i>	} of course,	<i>iduoró,</i>	perhaps, it may be.
<i>hegedang,</i>		<i>iduró,</i>	who knows ?
<i>he honang,</i>	truly, surely, it	<i>idutam,</i>	I don't know.
	would be so if.	<i>idu hale,</i>	who can tell !
<i>kachi,</i>	isn't it ! indeed ?	<i>alo</i>	is a prohibitive or precative negative
<i>kaoró,</i>	isn't it ! to be sure.		particle, which takes the Personal
<i>ka, kage,</i>			Pronouns as suffixes.
<i>banó, banóge,</i>	} no.		(For construction, see Part III,
<i>nala, nalage,</i>			page 170.)

INTERJECTIONS.

Mar ! all right ! go on ! go ahead ! (denotes approval).

martobe ! ditto (exhortative).

he mar ! all right ! (answers to a statement or request).

dola ! come along (a familiar exhortative. It generally takes the Pronominal Suffixes *lang* and *bu*).

dollang ! come along thou ! let's go both of us !

dolabu ! come along you ! let's go all of us !

ju ! away ! get away ! (this is a polite expression in connection with *senóme* only).

ju senóme !
mar senóme ! } good-bye ! good-bye then !
senóme mar !

mar heu ! all right then ! come on then ! (a very familiar address).

ela ! hela ! hallo ! (surprise, regret).

heina ! }
ajäga ! } alas ! (pain, sorrow, grief).
atanga !

ke ! indeed ! how wonderful ! Do you really mean to say so ?

Tirbole ! denotes intense joy and applause, at some one having, for instance, hit a mark or target with an arrow ; or at some similar feat.

A ! is used only in familiar address, chiefly to children. It never stands alone ; it may be suffixed to any of the above Interjections, to Nouns, Pronouns, Predicates, or to any word representing a proposition, as, *v. gr.*, elliptical questions or replies.

In some districts children at play or in conversation with each other use this Interjection very freely.

Mar-a ! all right. *Hijúme-a* ! come thou ! *am-a* ! thou there ! *Tobepe-a* ! go ahead then you ! (here *tobe*, and then, is used intransitively in the Imperative Mood, with the Interjectional Suffix *a*). *Okoi-a* ? Who (struck, understood). *Patras-a*. Peter (struck, understood). Peter protests saying, *Kae-a* ! No ! (Here the *e* is merely euphonic.)

Eho ! hey ! (is familiar to grown-up men. *Ho* seems to be a contraction of *horo*, man. *Ho* is the ordinary form for *horo* among the Larka Khols).

Ga ! This is used familiarly to such women only as are related to the speaker. It is suffixed to *he* or *e*, yes, as, *ega* ! to *ka* (no), *kaga* ! to *am* and *ape*, *amga* ! *epega* ! and to Imperatives, *v.gr.*, *hijúmega* ! come here !

Na ! is similarly suffixed in addresses to girls.

Emphatic, Dubitative, and Corrective Suffixes.

Ge is an Emphatic Suffix which may generally be translated by *indeed, certainly, of course*.

It may be suffixed to any word at all. If, however, it be used to emphasize a Transitive, Intransitive or Adjective Predicate, it becomes an *Infix*, since in that case it stands between the complete Predicate-form and the Copula, *v. gr.*, He will come, *hijúae*. He will surely come, *hijú-ge-ae*.

Ja and *tera* are Dubitative Suffixes equivalent to *perhaps, perchance, may be*. If suffixed to Predicates, they stand after the Copula, *v. gr.*, May be he will come,—*Hijúae-ja* or *hijúae-tera*.

Do is a Corrective Suffix.

1st.—It may very often be translated by *but, however*. In this function it is generally suffixed to the first word of the sentence, which in English would be introduced by *but*—

Ini-do kaeajana,—but that one did not agree. *Gapa-doo* hijúa,—but he will come to-morrow.

2nd.—It is used in really corrective replies, whether affirmative or negative, where in English no equivalent word would be used—

Is this the village-chief ? *Ní Munda taníchi* ? No, this is not the Munda,—*Ni Munda-do* ka. Is that one the chief ? *Ini Munda chi* ? No, this is the Munda,—*Ká, ní-do* Munda, or *Munda-do níge*.

3rd.—It is very frequently suffixed to the Conditional Mood-form in *re*—

If he be not at home, bring this letter back, but if he be, give it to him,—*Bangáire ne chitti auruaime, menáire-do omaime*.

4th.—It is used with a limitative function, and thus may often be rendered by the phrases *as far as that is concerned*, *so far as that goes*.

In this function it is suffixed to Predicates only. The Predicate must be repeated, viz., first stands the original form with *do* as Suffix, and then the full Predicate with Copula, Voice, Mood, and Tense-suffixes—

He can pay, he is the village-chief,—*Hal dariae, Munda tant*. He is the chief *so far as the name goes*, but he has no money,—*Munda-do munda akanæ takado banoátae*.

I can reach it, but I cannot lay hold of it (*i.e.*, as far as reaching it is concerned it can be reached),—*Teba-do tebagóa, mendo sab kaing daria*.

Derang and *chimad'* are emphatic Particles which are not merely affixed to other words, but they occupy an independent position in the sentence. They are equivalent to the English *certainly*, *surely*, *to be sure*, *forsooth*.

Hijúæ chimad',—He will surely come.

Derang is chiefly used in certain Conditional sentences (see page 205).

For the meaning and use of *honang* see pages 204 and 205.

EQUIVALENTS OF DECLENSIONS.

1. The so-called *Cases* of Nouns and Pronouns, if considered as attributes of words, are indicative of the various relations in which Nouns and Pronouns stand to the Predicate of a proposition, or to each other as parts of a proposition.

2. As stated in the Introduction, three of those relations are never denoted in Mundari Nouns or Pronouns by any Suffix, viz. (1) that of the Subject or *Nominative Case*; (2) that of the Direct Object or *Accusative* to a Transitive Predicate; (3) that of the Indirect Object or *Dative* to Transitive or Intransitive Predicates: hence we may say Mundari equivalents of Organic *Nominatives*, *Accusatives* and *Datives* of Nouns and Pronouns do not differ from each other in form. They are either the bare root, or the root *plus* the Dual Suffix, or the root *plus* the Plural Suffix.

The context of the proposition and to some extent the position occupied by a Noun or Pronoun in a sentence must show whether that Noun or Pronoun is the *Subject* or a *Direct* or an *Indirect Object*.

Regarding the position of these three Cases, it may be given as a more or less general rule that the Subject or Nominative stands first, the Dative second, and the Accusative third.—

N. A.

Ex.— Gomke dasie rákfa,—The master called the servant.

N. D. A.

Gomke dasi talabe omáfa,—The master gave the servant his wages.

3. All the other relations denoted by declensional Cases with or without Prepositions in Aryan languages are in Mundari expressed by suffixing to Nouns or Pronouns some one or other of the Postpositions enumerated in the Chapter on Postpositions.

What has been there said concerning the various meanings of each Postposition suffices to show how our purely Locative Accusatives and Ablatives as well as all other Ablatives and Datives are to be rendered.

4. There remains, however, one difficulty, viz., the correct rendering of our *Genitive Cases*. As many as five different Suffixes are used to express the various relations connoted by the single Genitive Case-form. The reason of this is that the Mundas treat all these relations as merely local ones; in other words, the Organic Genitive is by the Mundas split up into several *Locative Cases* or *relations*.

A few considerations to show how they view those relations. These considerations will at the same time point out the reason for the use of each Suffix, and thus assist the memory and facilitate the practical acquisition of these equivalents—

1st.—In a certain number of our Possessive and Partitive Genitives the spatial nature of the relation is easily discerned, *e. gr.*, the men *of the village*, the trees *of the forest*. What is directly indicated by these Genitives is a mere relation of space, viz., either the existence of inanimate objects in a certain place or the habitual dwelling of living beings within a certain area. These Genitives may even in English be rendered by a Preposition of Space: the trees *in* the forest, the men *in* the village.

This is mainly the mode of rendering them adopted by the Mundas: (a) they suffix *re* (in) to the Noun or Pronoun denoting a place; then if the Genitive in question depend on a word denoting a living being, the Demonstrative *en* (that) is added to *re*. This yields the Compound Suffix *ren*.

Hatu-re-en hoꝛo becomes *haturen* hoꝛo; *literally*, that man in the village, *i.e.*, the man of the village.

The last part of the Compound Suffix *ren* is in reality a Demonstrative Adjective qualifying the Noun which governs the Genitive, *i.e.*, in the present instance the word *hoꝛo*.

Since no Adjectives take the Dual or Plural Suffixes, it is plain that the Suffix *ren* remains unchanged even if the governing Noun be in the Dual or Plural—

Hatu-ren hoꝛoking, —Those two men in the village, *i.e.*, the two men *of* the village.

Hatu-ren hoꝛoko, —Those men in the village, *i.e.*, the men *of* the village.

(b) If the Genitive in question depend on a word denoting inanimate objects, the Impersonal Pronoun *a* (it) is added to *re*. This yields the Compound Suffix *red*. Hence—

The door of the house, —*Ord-red* duar, means literally the door it in the house.

The trees of the forest, —*Bir-red* daru, means literally the trees they in the forest.

2nd.—Such Genitives as *peace* OF MIND, *the meaning* OF THE WORD can, even in English, be intelligibly rendered by the Preposition *in*,

although the relation here signified is no longer a *purely* spatial one: hence—

Mon-*red* suku ; *literally*, peace it in the mind : peace of mind.

Kaji-*red* mundi ; *literally*, the meaning it in the word : the meaning of the word.

3rd.—Genitives denoting the *dimensions* of something, the *material* of which something is made, the *price* of something, and the *age* of some being are all rendered in the same way, viz.—

By the Suffix *ren* if they depend on words denoting living beings.

By the Suffix *red* if they depend on words denoting inanimate objects.

Ex.—

A ring of gold,—*Samrom-red* mudam ; *lit.*, the ring it in gold.

A bamboo of 3 yards,—*Api muka-red* mad' ; *lit.*, the bamboo it in 3 yards.

A cloth of 2 rupees,—*Bar taka-red* lija' ; *lit.*, the cloth it in 2 rupees.

4th.—The family is conceived as a moral unit or totum. On this assumption the relation between its members becomes one of mutual *partnership* and not of *real ownership*. Consequently the Suffix used to denote it is the same as that which is used for Partitive Genitives. Of course the Demonstrative *en* is substituted for the Impersonal *á* because there is question of living beings: hence *re-en* = *ren* instead of *red*. This is strictly observed to denote the relation between husband and wife—

Ex.—

The wife of the village-chief,—*Munda-ren* kúri.

Paku's wife,—*Paku-ren* kúri.

Sumi's husband,—*Sumi-ren* kora.

The relation between parents and children is frequently expressed in the same way. However, in this case, the idea of partnership is no longer so rigorously insisted on, and the ordinary Possessive Suffix *á* is used perhaps more frequently than the Partitive Suffix *ren*, thus showing that the relation between parent and child partakes already of the nature of real ownership—

Ex.—Paku's son,—*Paku-ren* hon or *Paku-á* hon.

5th.—The relation between a master and his servants is not conceived as one of real ownership, nor yet as that of real partnership, but merely as one of constant attendance: hence it is expressed by means of the Compound Locative Suffix *táre*, *about*, *near*, *around*, plus the Demonstrative *en*, i.e., *táren*—

Ex.—The servant of the village-chief,—*Munda-táren* dasi ; *lit.*, the servant the one about the village-chief.

The relation between a master and his domestic animals is often expressed in the same way—

Ex.—Paku's cattle,—*Paku-tären uriko* ; *lit.*, the cattle those about Paku.

It is even used sometimes of children—

Ex.—Paku's children,—*Paku-tären honko* ; *lit.*, the children those about Paku.

REMARK.—The use of the purely Possessive Suffix *a'* is apparently getting more common for the cases enumerated above. This must, I think, be attributed to two causes—

- (1) The ever-extending use of Hindi or Sadani.
- (2) The very unidiomatic Mundari spoken by missionaries and imitated by their catechists and other servants.

6th.—All other *Possessive* and *Partitive Genitives* of Nouns and Pronouns denoting *living beings* are rendered by means of the Suffix *á* (to)—

Ex.—The house of Paku,—*Paku-á ora* ; literally, the house *to* Paku.
Thy cloth,—*Am-á lijá* ; *lit.*, the cloth *to thee*.

REMARK.—Partitive Genitives, such as the horse's head, the branches of the tree, may also be rendered by mere *juxtaposition*, *v. gr.*—

Sadom-bó, instead of *Sadom-á bó*, a horse head.

Daru-koto, instead of *daru-rá koto*, tree branches.

What has so far been said may be summed up into the following rules :—

I.—Nouns and Pronouns standing as Subjects, Direct or Indirect Objects take no Suffix indicative of case relations.

II.—*Possessive Genitives* of Nouns and Pronouns depending on the word *servant* or its synonyms are generally rendered by means of the Suffix *tären*, sometimes by the Suffix *á*—

Jila gomke tären chaprassi chitti aukadac,—The chaprassi of the Deputy Commissioner has brought a letter. *Samu tären* dasie nirjana,—The servant of Samu has run away.

III.—*Possessive Genitives* of Nouns and Pronouns depending on the words *child*, *son*, *daughter*, *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *sister* are often rendered by means of the Suffix *ren*, sometimes by *tären*, more frequently by *á*—

<i>Pahanr-tären</i>	}	<i>kuri-hon Assamte arkid'idikiako</i> ,—They (<i>viz.</i> , the coolie-catchers) have taken the daughter of the sacrificer to Assam.
<i>Pahanr-ren</i>		
<i>Pahanr-á</i>		

IV.—Possessive Genitives of Common or Proper Nouns and Pronouns denoting persons are rendered by means of the Suffix *ren* when they depend on the words *husband* or *wife*—

Munda-*ren* kuri hola ruatee goéjana,—The Munda's wife died of fever yesterday. Buduni-*ren* kora erágee hasuakana,—The husband of Buduni is very sick.

V.—All the other Possessive and Partitive Genitives of Nouns or Pronouns denoting living beings not enumerated in the preceding rules must be rendered by means of the Suffix *á*—

Am-táren dasi-*á* lijá lojana,—The cloth of thy servant got burnt. Sigin-*á* orá handirijana,—The house of Sigin has collapsed.

VI.—Genitives of Proper or Common Nouns or Pronouns denoting seas, rivers, countries, towns, space or places, or single objects there and then considered as a place or a container of something must be rendered by the Suffix *ren* when they depend on words denoting *living beings*. The same Genitives are rendered by *rea'* when they depend on words denoting *inanimate objects*—

Ranchi-*ren* Uraonko Horoteko jagara,—The Uraons of Ranchi speak Mundari, Ranchi-*rea'* talaore marang haiko menákoa,—There are big fishes in the tank of Ranchi. Bir-*ren* maráko erágeko chirgala,—The peacocks of the forest (i.e., wild peacocks) are exceedingly shy. Bir-*rea'* dá tut'kungea,—The water of the forest is cool.

VII.—Genitives denoting age, price, dimension, or the material of which something is made must be rendered by *ren* when they depend on words denoting *living beings*. When they depend on words denoting *inanimate objects*, they are rendered by *rea'* or by *rá*—

Turui sirma-*ren* hon,—A child of six years. Monre taka-*ren* merom,—A goat of five rupees, i.e., a goat worth five rupees. Monre taka-*rea'* lijá,—A cloth of five rupees. Mod'hisi muka-*rea'* orá,—A house of 20 cubits, i.e., a house measuring 20 cubits. Bar muka-*ren* bing,—A snake of two cubits, i.e., measuring two cubits in length. Pital-*rea'* chipi,—A dish made of brass.

VIII.—Partitive Genitives of words denoting inanimate objects (i.e., Genitives denoting a part of some inanimate object or whole) are generally rendered by means of the contracted Suffix *rá*, rarely by *rea'*—

En ote-*rá* hatingem namtadachi ? Hast thou got a share of that land ?

IX.—The Definite Locative of rest of Nouns or Pronouns is formed by the Suffix *re*—

Ne hatu-*re* Dikuko bangkuá,—There are no Hindus in this village.

The *Indefinite Locative of rest* is formed by *târe*—

Khunti-*târe* Teliko isu oteko eserakada,—*About or around or near* Khunti the Telis have got hold of much land.

X.—The *Definite Locative of motion to of* Nouns or Pronouns denoting *space or places* is formed by the Suffix *te*—

Ranchi-*te* senóme,—*Go to Ranchi.* Bir-*te* nirjanako,—*They have run away to the forest.* Ne lijá gara-*te* idime,—*Take this cloth to the river.*

The *Indefinite Locative of motion to of* the same Nouns or Pronouns is formed by *tâte*—

The *Locative of motion to of all other Nouns and Pronouns* is formed by *tâte*.

Aing-*tâte* niraujanae,—*He came running to me.* En haturen Munda- *tâte* alom sena,—*Do not go to the Munda of that village.* Ne chipi gomke-*tâte* iditab'me,—*Take this letter quickly to the master.*

XI.—The *Definite Locative of motion from of* Nouns and Pronouns denoting *space or places* is formed by the Suffix *ate* or *ete*—

Náuterge kula ne lata-*ete* urunglena,—*A tiger came out just now from this den.* Hatu-*ete* nirjanae,—*He has run away from the village.* Sirma-*ete* uiújanae,—*He has fallen from the roof.*

The *Indefinite Locative of motion from of* the same Nouns and Pronouns is formed by the Suffix *táate* or *táete*—

Han hatu-*táeteko* niraujana,—*They came running from yonder village, i.e., from somewhere near yonder village.*

The *Locative of motion from of all other Nouns and Pronouns* is formed by the Suffix *táate* or *táete*—

Pahan-*táetem* hijútana chi? Ka, Munda-*táete*,—*Art thou coming from the pahan? No, from the Munda.*

XII.—The *Instrumental Case of Nouns and Pronouns* denoting *inanimate objects or irrational animals* is formed by the Suffix *te*—

Ne orá kecho-*te* dabakana,—*This house is covered with tiles.* Chipi diri-*te* karedo pital-*te* ko baiea,—*They make dishes with (or out of) stone or with brass.* Ne disumre uriko-*teko* siea, sadomko-*te* do ka,—*In this country they plough with bullocks, but never with horses.* Banduk-*te* goéked'koac,—*He killed them with a gun.*

XIII.—The *Instrumental Case of Nouns and Pronouns* denoting *human beings* is formed by suffixing *á* to these Nouns and Pronouns and then adding *horate*. This *horate* is by itself the *Instrumental Case of*

the word *hora* (way). It corresponds exactly to the Latin *viā*, and may therefore be rendered into English by *through* -

Amā horate le banchaujana,—We were saved *by* thee.

XIV.—*Ablative Cases of Nouns and Pronouns denoting living beings* and depending on such words as *to receive, to buy, to steal, and their synonyms* are rendered by means of the Suffix *ete* (see *ete* in the Chapter on Postpositions)—

Ne sadom Samu-ete kiringkía,—I bought this horse *from* Samu.

REMARK.—The words *to steal, to rob*, and their synonyms generally take a double accusative—

Paku *Samu otee rékía*, rather than *Paku Samu-ete otee rékeda*,—Paku has robbed Samu of his land. *Hola dakuko api hoŋo senhoratanko lijáko, tariko ad' takako réked'koa'ko*,—Yesterday dacoits robbed three travellers of their cloths, their brass plates, and their money.

XV.—*The Vocative* may be preceded by the Interjection *e! he!* Very often the tone of the Voice alone distinguishes it from the Nominative form.

In familiar addresses it may take one or other of the Interjectional Suffixes given above (pages 83 and 84).

The following schemes may serve as a synoptical recapitulation of these rules. The first scheme represents words denoting space or places. The second represents words denoting such inanimate objects as may at times be considered as places or receptacles. The third represents words denoting irrational animals. The fourth represents words denoting human beings:—

Singular, Dual, and Plural.

Subject, Direct and Indirect Object—	<i>Bir</i> ,	the forest, a forest, forest or forests.
Locative Genitive.	{ dependent on words de- <i>Bir-ren</i> ,	(living beings) of the forest,
	{ noting living beings.	&c.
	{ dependent on words de- <i>Bir-red</i> ,	(inanimate objects) of the
	{ noting inanimate objects.	forest, &c.
Definite Locative of rest—	<i>Bir-re</i> ,	in the forest, &c.
Indefinite Locative of rest—	<i>Bir-táre</i> ,	about, or somewhere in the forest, &c.
Definite Locative of motion to—	<i>Bir-te</i> ,	to the forest, &c.
Indefinite Locative of motion to—	<i>Bir-táte</i> ,	towards the forest, &c.
Definite Locative of motion from—	<i>Bir-ete</i> ,	from the forest, &c.
Indefinite Locative of motion from—	<i>Bir-táate</i> or <i>táate</i> .	from the direction of the forest, &c.

Singular.

Nominative, Dative, Accusative—	<i>Sadom,</i>	the horse, a horse, horse.
Possessive and Partitive Genitive—	<i>Sadom-á,</i>	of the horse, the horse's.
Definite Locative of rest—	<i>Sadom-re,</i>	on the horse, in the horse.
Indefinite Locative of rest—	<i>Sadom-táre,</i>	near or about the horse.
Definite and Indefinite motion to—	<i>Sadom-táte,</i>	to or towards the horse.
Definite Locative of motion from—	<i>Sadom-ete,</i>	from the horse.
Indefinite Locative of motion from—	<i>Sadom-táete,</i>	from near the horse.
Instrumental—	<i>Sadom-te,</i>	with or by means of the horse, on horse-back.
Ablative—	<i>Sadom-ete,</i>	from the horse.
Vocative—	<i>He sadom !</i>	horse!

The Dual *sadomking*, two horses, and the Plural *sadomko*, horses take the same Suffixes as the Singular—

Ex.—

Sadomkingá, of the two horses; *sadomkingre*, in or on the two horses.
Sadomkotáre, near the horses; *sadomkoete*, from the horses.

Singular.

Nominative, Dative, and Accusative	<i>Munda,</i>	the village-chief.
Possessive Genitive dependent on the word wife	<i>Munda-ren</i>	(the wife) of the village-chief
Possessive Genitive dependent on the word servant	<i>Munda-táren</i> or <i>á</i>	(the servant) of the village- chief.
Other Possessive Genitives—	<i>Munda-á,</i>	of the village-chief.
Definite Locative of rest—	<i>Munda-re,</i>	in or on the village-chief.
Indefinite Locative of rest—	<i>Munda-táre,</i>	near or about the village- chief.
Definite and Indefinite Locative of motion to	<i>Munda-táte,</i>	to the village-chief.
Definite and Indefinite Locative of motion from	<i>Munda-táete,</i>	from the village-chief.
Instrumental—	<i>Munda-á horate,</i>	through the village-chief.
Ablative—	<i>Munda-ete,</i>	from the village-chief.
Vocative—	<i>He Munda !</i>	O village-chief!

The Dual *Mundaking* and the Plural *Mundako* take the same Suffixes as the Singular.

Pronouns take the Case-suffixes which would be taken by the Nouns

Singular.

Masc. & Fem.

Nominative, Dative, Accusative	<i>Aing,</i>	I.
Genitives— { <i>aing-ren,</i> <i>aing-tären,</i> <i>ain-d,</i> }	my.
Definite Locative of rest—	<i>aing-re,</i>	in or on me.
Indefinite Locative of rest,	<i>aing-täre,</i>	about me.
Definite and Indefinite Locative of motion to—	} <i>aing-täte,</i>	to me.
Definite and Indefinite Locative of motion from—	} <i>aing-täete,</i>	from me.
Ablative—	<i>aing-ete</i>	from me.
Instrumental—	<i>ainä horate,</i>	through me. }

REMARK.—Nouns ending in *s* sometimes insert a euphonic *e* or *o* between this consonant

Patronymics as well as other Proper and Common Nouns are obtained *ren* or *tären*. These Nouns take all the Dual, Plural, and Case-

The Singular forms thus derived from Proper names of men or whereas the Singular forms thus derived from Proper names of women

The Plural forms thus derived from Proper names of either men or *the family of*, i.e., all the inmates of the house, grand-parents, husband *Pakurenko*, Paku's family.

N.B.—If, however, such a Dual or Plural form be derived from the name of a man known

REMARK.—The expressions *the family of*, *the inmates of the house of* are more frequently family of Paku.

for which they there and then stand:—

Singular.		Singular.	
Masc. & Fem.		Masc. & Fem.	
<i>Ini,</i>	that one.	<i>Hana,</i>	that one yonder.
<i>Ini-ren,</i>	} of that one.	<i>Hana-ren,</i>	} of that one yonder.
<i>Ini-tären,</i>		<i>Hana-red,</i>	
<i>Ini-ä,</i>		<i>Hana-rä,</i>	
<i>Ini-re,</i>	in or on that one.	<i>Hana-re,</i>	in or on that one yonder.
<i>Ini-täre,</i>	{ about or near that one.	<i>Hana-täre,</i>	about or near that one yonder.
<i>Ini-täte,</i>	to that one.	<i>Hana-te,</i>	to and towards that one yonder.
<i>Ini-täete,</i>	from that one.	<i>Hana-ete,</i>	} from, and from the direction of that one yonder.
<i>Ini-ete,</i>	from that one.	<i>Hana-täete,</i>	
<i>Ini-ä horate,</i>	through that one.	<i>Hana-ete,</i>	from „
<i>Ini-te,</i>	(of irrational animals).	<i>Hana-te,</i>	{ by, with or out of that one yonder.

and the Possessive Suffix *ä*. Hence the forms *Paulus-o-ä*, *Paulus-e-ä*, or *Paulus-ä*, of Paul.

ed by suffixing the Personal Pronouns *i*, *king*, *ko* to the Genitive in suffixes of ordinary Nouns.

from Pronouns standing for such names always mean *the wife of* ; or from Pronouns standing for such names mean *the husband of*.

women or from Pronouns standing for such names generally mean or wife, children, grand-children, *v. gr.*, *Samu-reni*, Samu's wife.

as a polygamist, it may mean *the two wives of*, or *the wives of*.

rendered by suffixing *te*, followed by the Plural *ko* to the Proper name, *v. gr.*, *Paku-te-ko*, the

Pronouns take the Case-suffixes which would be taken by the Nouns

Singular.		
Masc. & Fem.		
Nominative, Dative, Accusative	<i>Aing,</i>	I.
Genitives— { <i>aing-ren,</i> <i>aing-tären,</i> <i>ain-ä,</i> }	my.
Definite Locative of rest—	<i>aing-re,</i>	in or on me.
Indefinite Locative of rest,	<i>aing-täre,</i>	about me.
Definite and Indefinite Locative of motion to—	} <i>aing-täte,</i>	to me.
Definite and Indefinite Locative of motion from—	} <i>aing-tätele,</i>	from me.
Ablative—	<i>aing-ete</i>	from me.
Instrumental—	<i>ainä horate,</i>	through me. }

REMARK.—Nouns ending in *s* sometimes insert a euphonic *e* or *o* between this consonant

Patronymics as well as other Proper and Common Nouns are obtained *ren* or *tären*. These Nouns take all the Dual, Plural, and Case-

The Singular forms thus derived from Proper names of men or whereas the Singular forms thus derived from Proper names of women

The Plural forms thus derived from Proper names of either men or *the family of*, i.e., all the inmates of the house, grand-parents, husband *Pakurenko*, Paku's family.

N.B.—If, however, such a Dual or Plural form be derived from the name of a man known

REMARK.—The expressions *the family of*, *the inmates of the house of* are more frequently family of Paku.

for which they there and then stand:—

Singular.		Singular.	
Masc. & Fem.		Masc. & Fem.	
<i>Ini</i> ,	that one.	<i>Hana</i> ,	that one yonder.
<i>Ini-ren</i> ,	} of that one.	<i>Hana-ren</i> ,	} of that one yonder.
<i>Ini-tären</i> ,		<i>Hana-ré</i> ,	
<i>Ini-á</i> ,		<i>Hana-rá</i> ,	
<i>Ini-re</i> ,	in or on that one.	<i>Hana-re</i> ,	in or on that one yonder.
<i>Ini-täre</i> ,	{ about or near that one.	<i>Hana-täre</i> ,	about or near that one yonder.
<i>Ini-täte</i> ,	to that one.	<i>Hana-te</i> ,	to and towards that one yonder.
		<i>Hana-täte</i> ,	
<i>Ini-táete</i> ,	from that one.	<i>Hana-ete</i> ,	{ from, and from the direction of that one yonder.
		<i>Hana-táete</i> ,	
<i>Ini-ete</i> ,	from that one.	<i>Hana-ete</i> ,	from „
<i>Ini-á horate</i> ,	through that one.		
<i>Ini-te</i> ,	(of irrational animals).	<i>Hana-te</i> ,	{ by, with or out of that one yonder.

and the Possessive Suffix *á*. Hence the forms *Paulus-o-á*, *Paulus-e-á*, or *Paulus-á*, of Paul.

ed by suffixing the Personal Pronouns *i*, *king*, *ko* to the Genitive in suffixes of ordinary Nouns.

from Pronouns standing for such names always mean *the wife of* ; or from Pronouns standing for such names mean *the husband of*.

women or from Pronouns standing for such names generally mean or wife, children, grand-children, *v. gr.*, *Samu-reni*, Samu's wife.

as a polygamist, it may mean *the two wives of*, or *the wives of*.

rendered by suffixing *te*, followed by the Plural *ko* to the Proper name, *v. gr.*, *Paku-te-ko*, the

Belait, Europe
Ranchi, Ranchi.
Hatu, village.
Nagar, town.
Iskul, school.

Bir, forest.

Lau, a boat.

Jehel, jail.

Raja, king.

Soma (man's name).

Sumi (woman's name).

Somarenking, { the wife of Soma.
the two wives of
Soma.

Sumirenko, the family of
Sumi.

Belaitren, of Europe.
Rachiren, of Ranchi.
Haturen, of the village.
Nagarren, of the town.
Iskulren, of the school.

Birren, of the forest.

Lauren, of the boat.

Jehelren, of the jail.

Rajatären, of the king.

Somaren, of Soma.

Sumiren, of Sumi.

REMARK.—The Compounds derived from *Proper Names of Countries, towns, and villages* immediately to the Nouns—

Ex.—*Ranchireni*, a Ranchiite ; *Ranchiking*, two Ranchiites ; *Ranchiko*, Ranchiites.

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
<i>Belaitren-i,</i>	European.	<i>Belaitren-king.</i>	<i>Belaitren-ko.</i>
<i>Ranchireni,</i>	Ranchiite.	<i>Ranchirenking.</i>	<i>Ranchirenko.</i>
<i>Hatureni,</i>	villager.	<i>Haturenking.</i>	<i>Haturenko.</i>
<i>Nagarreni,</i>	townsman.	<i>Nagarrenking.</i>	<i>Nagarrenko.</i>
<i>Iskulreni,</i>	school-child, a student.	<i>Iskulrenking.</i>	<i>Iskulrenko.</i>
<i>Birreni,</i>	{ a wild beast. a savage. a stupid fellow.	<i>Birrenking.</i>	<i>Birrenko.</i>
<i>Laureni,</i>	{ sailor. passenger.	<i>Laurenking.</i>	<i>Laurenko.</i>
<i>Jehelreni,</i>	prisoner.	<i>Jehelrenking.</i>	<i>Jehelrenko.</i>
<i>Rajatäreni,</i>	king's servant.	<i>Rajatärenking.</i>	<i>Rajatärenko.</i>
<i>Somarení,</i>	Soma's wife.		
<i>Sumireni,</i>	Sumi's husband.		
<i>Somarenko,</i>	the wives of Soma, or the family of Soma.		

frequently drop the Suffix *ren* in the Dual and Plural, the Pronouns *king* and *ko* being suffixed.

POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVES AND POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVE-SUFFIXES.

1st.—The Possessive Genitives of Personal, Demonstrative, Indefinite, and Interrogative Pronouns are used as Possessive Adjectives.

As such, they stand before the Noun they qualify and remain always unchanged, *i.e.*, they take no Suffixes indicative of either Gender, Number, or Case.

Example.—*Aiñá* sadom, my horse; *amá* uríko, thy bullocks; *akoá* loeong, their rice-fields; *iniá* lijá, that one's cloth; *okoiá* orá, whose house? *amtären* dasi, thy servant. *Nitären* honko, this one's children.

REMARK.—The Possessive Adjectives *aleá* and *akoá* often drop the Suffix *á* before the words *orá* (house) and *hatu* (village).

Example.—Our house,—*aleá* orá or *ale* orá; our village,—*aleá* hatu or *ale* hatu.

Their house,—*akoá* orá, or *ako* orá; their village,—*akoá* hatu, or *ako* hatu.

2nd.—The Possessive Adjectives *my*, *thy*, *his*, etc., are very frequently rendered by suffixing to the Noun denoting the beings or objects possessed the Compound Suffixes *taing*, *tam*, *tae*, *talang*, *taling*, *tabu*, *tale*, *tape*, *tako*—

Sadomtaing, my horse.

Orátam, thy house.

Lijdtæ, his cloth.

Hatutalang, our (my and thy) village.

Meromkotaling, mine and his goat.

Uríkingtaben, the two bullocks belonging to you two.

Simkotaking, the fowls belonging to the two.

Disumtabu, our (my and your) country.

Setakotale, our (my and their) dogs.

Haketape, your axe, or your axes.

Bakritako, their garden.

3rd.—When the Possessives *my* and *thy* qualify Nouns denoting family relations, they are generally rendered by suffixing simply *ing* and *me* or *m* to those Nouns. *Me* is suffixed to Nouns ending in a consonant, *v.gr* *hon-me*, thy child; *m* is suffixed to Nouns ending in a vowel, *v.gr.* *nga-m*, thy mother.

The corresponding Dual and Plural Possessives of the 1st and 2nd Persons are rendered by means of the Suffixes *talang*, *taling*, *tabu*, *tale taben*, *tape*.

The Possessive *his* or *her* is rendered by suffixing *te* to the same Nouns.

The *Inclusive Duals and Plurals* are formed by suffixing *talang* and *tabu* respectively to the Noun, *v.gr.*, *aputalang*, thy and my father; *aputabu*, your and my father.

But the *Exclusive Duals and Plurals* insert *ing* before *taling* and *tale*.

Example.—*Apuingtaling*, literally, my father, his and my.

Apuingtale, literally, my father, theirs and my.

Similarly, the 2nd Person Dual and Plural inserts *m* or *me* before *taben* and *tape*.

Example.—*Bokomtaben*, literally, thy junior brother, his and thy.

Bokomtape, literally, thy junior brother, their and thy.

The corresponding Dual and Plural Possessives of *the two* and *theirs* are rendered by suffixing *te*, plus *taking* and *tako*, respectively, to the Nouns in question—

<i>Apuing</i> , my father.	<i>Aputalang</i> , my and thy father. <i>Apuingtaling</i> , my and his or her father.	<i>Aputabu</i> , my and your father. <i>Apuingtale</i> , my and their father.
<i>Apum</i> , thy father.	<i>Apumtaben</i> , the father of you two.	<i>Apumtape</i> , your father.
<i>Apute</i> , his or her father.	{ <i>Aputaking</i> , } the father of the two. { <i>Aputetaking</i> , }	{ <i>Aputako</i> , } their father. { <i>Aputetako</i> , }

The Compounds thus obtained with the Suffixes *ing*, *me* or *m* and *te* are very freely used with the declensional Suffixes. Thus—

Apuinã orã, my father's house; *apumã*, of thy father; *aputeã*, of his father.

Apuingtãren dasi, my father's servant; *apumtãren*, of thy father; *aputetãren*, of his father.

Apuingtãte senome, go to my father; *apumtãte*, to thy father; *apute-
tãte* { at his father's.
 { with his father.

REMARK.—The Dual and Plural, etc., forms, *aputalang*, etc., may likewise add the declensional Suffixes to the Possessive Suffixes *talang*, etc. But this is not often done. When the expressions *our father*, etc., *your father*, etc., stand in a Case different from the Nominative, Dative or Accusative, then they are generally rendered by the construction given under No. 1, viz., the Genitive of the Personal or other Pronoun is placed before the Noun, and then the Case-suffixes are added immediately to the Noun itself—

Example—

My and thy father's, *Aputalang-ã*; more frequently *Alangã apuã*.

Our brother's servant, *Bautabutãren dasi*, more frequently *Abuã bautãren dasi*.

The same rule holds good, with a slight modification, for the formation of the Dual and Plural of the following Compounds:—

Nouns denoting family relations always take the Dual and Plural Suffixes after the Possessive Suffixes *ing*, *me* or *m* and *te*, but not immediately, for *te* is inserted between the Possessive Suffixes and the Suffixes *king* and *ko*,—

Example—

My two senior paternal uncles	...	<i>Gungu-ing-te-king.</i>
Thy two junior paternal uncles	...	<i>Kaka-m-te-king.</i>
His two sisters	...	<i>Misi-te-te-king.</i>
My senior brothers	...	<i>Bau-ing-te-ko.</i>
Thy junior brothers	...	<i>Boko-m-te-ko.</i>
His sisters	...	<i>Misi-te-te-ko.</i>

The Dual and Plural Suffixes may, in the same manner, be taken after the Possessive Suffixes *talang*, *taling*, etc., etc., but in this case the construction given under No. 1 is more frequent—

Example—

My two senior brothers,—	<i>Bau-ing-tale-ta-king</i> ; oftener <i>aled bau-te-king.</i>
Your two junior brothers,—	<i>Boko-m-tape-ta-king</i> ; oftener <i>apedboko-te-king.</i>
Their sisters,	{ <i>misi-te-ko-ta-ko</i> ; oftener <i>akod misi-teko.</i> <i>misi-te-teko</i> ; or <i>akod misi-te-te-ko.</i>

N.B.—(1) In the Compounds *bau-ing-tale-ta-ko*, etc., the inserted *te* is very often changed into *ta*, as in the examples given above.

(2) Nouns denoting family relations always insert *te* before the Dual and Plural Suffixes. Thus fathers, *apu-te-ko* ; mothers, *enga-te-ko* ; sisters, *misi-te-ko*.

The above Dual and Plural compounds, in which the Singular Possessive Suffixes *ing*, *me* (*m*) and *te* occur, always take the Case-suffixes ; whereas those in which the Dual and Plural Possessive Suffixes occur do so less frequently—

Example—

<i>Gunguingteking-d ord</i>	...	The house of my two senior uncles.
<i>Kakamteking-taren dasiko</i>	...	The servants of thy two junior uncles.
<i>Misiteteko-ren korako</i>	...	} The husbands of his sisters.
<i>Misiteteko-renko</i>	...	

The Compounds *taing*, *tam*, *tae*, *talang*, *taling*, etc., may also be prefixed to the Noun denoting the object possessed.

Nea *tam* lijá ? Is this *thy* cloth ? Ad'janae *taing* urí,—I lost *my* bullock. Idiked'koaks *taben* meromko,—They took away the goats *belonging to you two*.

This very remarkable transposition is not used as frequently as the forms where the Possessives *taing*, *tam*, etc., stand as Suffixes.

The *ta* of these Possessive Suffixes or Prefixes is no doubt the same as the *tá* in the Compound Possessive Suffixes *tären* and the Postposition *tá*, which, as shown above, is probably a compound of *ta* plus *á*. Hence *taing* would literally mean *to me*, or *that which is to me*, *that which belongs to me*.

To judge from analogy, the Possessive Suffix *te*, *his* or *hers*, must originally have been a Pronominal Demonstrative equivalent to the l. b. form *í*, *he* or *she*, or perhaps it was a Pronoun used both impersonally and personally. If it be admissible, as conjectured above, that the Impersonal Pronoun *á*, *it*, has been transferred to the function of a Locative denoting *to*, it may be supposed on the same grounds that the original Pronoun *te* (*he*, *she* and *it*) has been transferred to the same function, and that consequently the Locative Postposition *te*, *to*, is identically the same root as the Possessive Suffix *te*. The existence of the Impersonal and Personal forms *á* and *i* would naturally lead to the exclusive use of *te* in its *locative* function except in such original forms as the Possessives enumerated above.

In Yakuti *ta*, *tä* occurs as *Possessive* Suffix of the 3rd Person Singular, but not as *Subjective* Affix.

Possessive

1. Possessive Pronominal Compounds are obtained from Personal, Demonstrative *ní, nea* for the Singular, and

SINGU

1st Person	LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Aĩńđ-ní,</i>	mine
	INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Aĩńđ-nea,</i>	mine
2nd Person	LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Amá-ní,</i>	} thine
	INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Amá-nea,</i>			
3rd Person	LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Aeá-ní,</i>	} his or hers
	INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Aeá-nea,</i>			

Demonstrative

LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Níńđ-ní,</i>	} the one belonging to this
INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Níńđ-nea,</i>	
LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Iníńđ-ní,</i>	} the one belonging to that
INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Iníńđ-nea,</i>	
LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Haníńđ-ní,</i>	} the one belonging to that
INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Haníńđ-nea,</i>	

Interrogative and

{ LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Okoińđ-ní ?</i>	} whose one ?
	INANIM. OBJECTS— <i>Okoińđ-nea ?</i>	
LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Chilekaníńđ-ní ?</i>	...
INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Chilekaníńđ-nea ?</i>	...
LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Chikaníńđ-ní ?</i>	...
INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Chikaníńđ-nea ?</i>	...
LIVING BEINGS—	<i>Jetaińđ-ní</i>	...
INANIM. OBJECTS—	<i>Jetaińđ-nea</i>	...

DU

<i>Aĩńđ-king,</i>	my two ones.	{ <i>Alangáking</i>	...
<i>Amá-king,</i>	thy two.		...
<i>Aeá-king,</i>	his or her two.	<i>Abená-king</i>	...
<i>Níńđ-king,</i>	the two of this one.	<i>Akingá-king</i>	...
<i>Iníńđ-king,</i>	the two of that one.	<i>Níkingá-king</i>	...
<i>Haníńđ-king,</i>	the two of that one yonder.	<i>Inkingá-king</i>	...
<i>Okoińđ-king ?</i>	whose two ?	<i>Hankíńđ-king</i>	...
		<i>Okokíńđ-king</i>	...
		<i>Jetaińđ-king, or Janjetaińđ-king</i>	...

PLU

<i>Aĩńđ-ko,</i>	mine	{ <i>Alangá-ko</i>	...
	&c.				...
				<i>&c.,</i>	...
				<i>Chilekaníńđko ?</i>	...
				<i>Chilekankíńđko ?</i>	...
				<i>Chilekankoińđko ?</i>	...
				<i>Chikaníńđko ?</i>	...
				<i>Jetaińđ-ko ?</i>	...

Pronouns.

Demonstrative, and Interrogative Pronouns by suffixing to them the *king* and *ko* for the Dual and Plural—

LAR.

{ <i>Alangá-ní,</i>	mine and thine.	{ <i>Abud-ní,</i>	mine and yours.
{ <i>Alingá-ní,</i>	mine and his or hers.	{ <i>Aled-ní,</i>	mine and theirs.
{ <i>Alangá-nea,</i>	mine and thine.	{ <i>Abud-nea,</i>	mine and yours.
{ <i>Alingá-nea,</i>	mine and his or hers.	{ <i>Aled-nea,</i>	mine and theirs.
{ <i>Abend-ní,</i>	{ the one which belongs to you two.	{ <i>Aped-ní,</i>	{ yours.
{ <i>Abend-nea,</i>		{ <i>Aped-nea,</i>	
{ <i>Akingá-ní,</i>	{ the one which belongs to the two.	{ <i>Akod-ní,</i>	{ theirs.
{ <i>Akingá-nea,</i>		{ <i>Akod-nea,</i>	

Compounds.

{ <i>Nikingá-ní,</i>	{ the one belonging to these two.	{ <i>Nikudá-ní,</i>	{ the one belonging to these ones.
{ <i>Nikingá-nea,</i>		{ <i>Nikudá-nea,</i>	
{ <i>Inkingá ní,</i>	{ the one belonging to those two.	{ <i>Inkudá-ní,</i>	{ the one belonging to those.
{ <i>Inkingá-nea,</i>		{ <i>Inkudá-nea,</i>	
{ <i>Hankingá-ní,</i>	{ the one belonging to those two yonder.	{ <i>Hankodá-ní,</i>	{ the one belonging to those yonder.
{ <i>Hankingá-nea,</i>		{ <i>Hankodá-nea,</i>	

Indefinite Compounds.

{ <i>Okokingá-ní ?</i>	{ the one of which two ?	{ <i>Okokodá-ní or okoiokoidá-ní ?</i>	{ the one of which one's ?
{ <i>Okokingá-nea ?</i>		{ <i>Okokodá-nea or okoiokoidá-nea ?</i>	

the one belonging to what sort of a (man or animal) ?

the one belonging to what sort of a (thing) ?

the one belonging to what kind or class (of living beings) ?

the one belonging to what kind or class (of thing) ?

any one's at all (living beings).

any one's at all (inanim. objects).

AL.

the two belonging to thee and me.	<i>Abudking</i> , the two belonging to you and me.
the two belonging to him and me.	<i>Abedking</i> , the two belonging to them and me.
the two belonging to you two.	<i>Aped-king</i> , the two belonging to you.
the two belonging to the two.	<i>Akod-king</i> , the two belonging to them.
the two belonging to these two.	<i>Nikudá-king</i> , the two belonging to these.
the two belonging to those two.	<i>Inkudá-king</i> , the two belonging to those.
the two belonging to yonder two.	<i>Hankodá-king</i> , the two belonging to yonder ones.
the two belonging to which two ?	<i>Okoiokoidá-king</i> , whose two ?
the two belonging to any one at all.	

RAL.

those belonging to thee and me.	<i>Abudá-ko</i> , those belonging to me and you.
those belonging to him and me (her).	<i>Aledá-ko</i> , those belonging to me and them.

&c.

what is the one like, whose ones you ask ?

what are the two like, which you ask ?

what are those like, whose ones you ask ?

to what class belongs the one, whose ones you ask ?, etc.

those of any one at all.

2nd.—*Qualitative Possessive Pronouns* are derived from the above by for the Dual, and *lekako* or *lekanko* for the Plural, whenever these Pro

SING

1st Person	LIVING BEINGS	... { <i>Aiñánilekai,</i> <i>Aiñánilekani,</i> <i>Aiñálekai,</i> <i>Aiñá-lekani,</i>	} one like the one which belongs to me; one like mine.
	INANIM. OBJECTS	... { <i>Aiñá-nealeka,</i> <i>Aiñá-leka,</i>	} one like mine ...

Du

1st Person	LIVING BEINGS	... { <i>Aiñáni-lekaking,</i> <i>Aiñáni-lekanking,</i>	} two like mine ...
	LIVING BEINGS	... { <i>Aiñá-lekaking,</i> <i>Aiñá-lekanking,</i>	} two like mine.
	INANIM. OBJECTS	... { <i>Aiñánealeka,</i> <i>Aiñá-leka,</i>	} two like the one belonging to me.

PLU

1st Person	LIVING BEINGS	... { <i>Aiñánilekako,</i> <i>Aiñánilekanko,</i> <i>Aiñá-lekako,</i> <i>Aiñá-lekanko,</i>	} (some) like my one.
	INANIM. OBJECTS	... { <i>Aiñánealeka,</i> <i>Aiñá-leka,</i>	} those or some like my one.

suffixing to them *lekai* or *lekani* for the Singular, *lekaking* or *lekanking* nouns denote living beings—

ULAR.

<i>Alangá-ní-lekai,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and thee.	<i>Abuá-nílekai,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and you.
<i>Alangá-ní-lekani,</i>			<i>Abuá-nílekani,</i>		
<i>Alangá-lekai,</i>			<i>Abuá-lekai,</i>		
<i>Alingá-lekani,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and him (her).	<i>Aledá-ní-lekai,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and them.
<i>Alingá-nílekai,</i>			<i>Aledá-ní-lekani,</i>		
<i>Alingá-lekai,</i>			<i>Aledá-lekai,</i>		
<i>Alangá-lekani,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and thee.	<i>Aledá-lekani,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and you.
<i>Alangá-nealeka,</i>			<i>Abuá-nealeka,</i>		
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Aledá-nealeka,</i>		
<i>Alingá-nealeka,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and him.	<i>Abuá-leka,</i>	{	one like the one belonging to me and them.
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Aledá-leka,</i>		
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Aledá-leka,</i>		

AL.

<i>Alangánilekaking,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and thee.	<i>Abuáni-lekaking,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and you.
<i>Alangánilekanking,</i>			<i>Abuáni-lekanking,</i>		
<i>Alangá-lekaking,</i>			<i>Abuá-lekaking,</i>		
<i>Alingá-lekanking,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and him or her.	<i>Abuá-lekanking,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and them.
<i>Alingá-lekaking,</i>			<i>Aledá-nílekaking,</i>		
<i>Alingá-lekanking,</i>			<i>Aledá-nílekanking,</i>		
<i>Alangánealeka,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and thee.	<i>Aledá-lekanking,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and you.
<i>Alangá-leka,</i>			<i>Abuánealeka,</i>		
<i>Alingánealeka,</i>			<i>Abuá-leka,</i>		
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and him (her)	<i>Aledánealeka,</i>	{	two like the one belonging to me and them.
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Abuá-leka,</i>		
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Aledá-leka,</i>		

RAL.

<i>Alangánilekako,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and thee.	<i>Abuá-nílekako,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and you.
<i>Alangánilekanko,</i>			<i>Abuá-nílekanko,</i>		
<i>Alangá-lekako,</i>			<i>Abuá-lekako,</i>		
<i>Alingá-lekanko,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and him or her.	<i>Abuá-lekanko,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and them.
<i>Alingá-nílekako,</i>			<i>Aledá-nílekako,</i>		
<i>Alingá-nílekanko,</i>			<i>Aledá-nílekanko,</i>		
<i>Alingá-lekako,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and thee.	<i>Aledá-lekako,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and you.
<i>Alingá-lekanko,</i>			<i>Abuánealeka,</i>		
<i>Alangánealeka,</i>			<i>Abuá-leka,</i>		
<i>Alingánealeka,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and him.	<i>Aledánealeka,</i>	{	those or some like the one belong- ing to me and them.
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Abuá-leka,</i>		
<i>Alingá-leka,</i>			<i>Aledá-leka,</i>		

Similar Compounds are obtained from the Personal Pronouns of the Second and Third Persons, as well as from Definite and Indefinite Demonstrative Pronouns and from Interrogative Pronouns—

Amánilekaí, *amálekai*, etc., one like thine; *abenánilekai*, etc., one like the one belonging to you two; *akoónilekaí*, one like the one belonging to them; *nkíngánealeka*, one (inan. obj.) like the one belonging to those two; *hanídeleka king*, two like the one belonging to yonder one; *okoidlekanko namtanam*? Like whose ones do you want? or to the one of which one must those resemble whom you want? *Chilekankodílekaním idia*? What are those ones like to whom belongs the one (living being) that resembles the one you intend taking away?

The Compounds thus obtained may be further multiplied by substituting either the Dual *king* or the Plural *ko* to the Demonstrative *ní* in the first part of the Compounds—

Example—

Aíiá-kinglekai, one like my two; *alaugákinglekaking*, two like the two which belong to me and thee; *aleákinglekanko*, those like the two which belong to me and them. *Nikuáko lekaní*,—One like the ones belonging to these ones.

Nouns are very often substituted for the Demonstrative *ní* or the Personal Pronouns *king* and *ko*. The Suffixes *lekai* or *lekaní*, *lekaking*, or *lekanko*, *lekako* or *lenkanko* remain of course.

Ex.—

Chilekan sadomem namtana? What kind of horse dost thou want?

Amá sadom-lekaníing namtana,—I want one like thy horse. Instead of—

Amá-ní-lekaníing namtana.

Okolekan setako sukutoam? What kind of dogs are to your taste?

Amá setaking-lekanko,—Those that are like your two dogs. Instead of—
amá-king-lekanko.

The Possessive-Adjective Suffixes are added to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates with the function of Possessive Pronouns, thus:

If the Pronominal Subject precedes the Predicate, then the Possessive Suffixes are added to the Copula.

If the Pronominal Subject be suffixed to the Copula, then the Possessive Suffixes are added to the suffixed Subject—

S. Pr. C.

Meang ko idi-a- *taing*

Meang ko idi a- *tam*

Meang ko idi-a- *tae*

... } After to-morrow they will take my one,
... } thy one, his one.
...

S. Pr. C.

Am iditan-a- *taking*

Am iditan-a- *tabu*

Am iditan-a- *tale*

... } Now thou takest the one belonging to
... } them, to me and you, etc.
...

S. Pr. C.

Hola-ko idiked a- <i>taing</i>	...	} Yesterday they took mine, thine, his or hers.
Hola-ko idiked a- <i>tam</i>	...	
Hola-ko idiked a- <i>tae</i>	...	

Pr. $\overline{\text{D.O.}}$ C. S.

Idi-ko. a- e- <i>talang</i>	...	} He (she) will take those belonging to me and thee, to me and him or her, to you two.
Idi-ko. a- e- <i>taling</i>	...	
Idi-ko. a- e- <i>taben</i>	...	

P. $\overline{\text{D.O.}}$ Tense. C. S.

Idi-ko. tan- a- m- <i>tape</i>	...	} Now thou takest those belonging to you, to them, to me.
Idi-ko. tan- a- m- <i>tako</i>	...	
Idi-ko. tan- a- m- <i>taing</i>	...	

Pr. $\overline{\text{D.O.}}$ C. S.

Idiked'-ko. a- ben- <i>talang</i>	...	} You two took those belonging to me and thee, to me and him, to the two.
Idiked'-ko. a- ben- <i>taling</i>	...	
Idiked'-ko. a- ben- <i>taking</i>	...	

Instead of the Adjective Suffixes *taing*, *tam*, *tae*, etc., the Genitive form, *i.e.*, the corresponding Pronominal Suffixes *taĩñá*, *tamá*, *taed*, *talangá*, *talingá*, etc., may also be added to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates in the manner indicated above—

Adjana-tuiñá,—My one (inanimate object) got lost. *Nirjanae-tamá*,—Thine (living being) ran away. *Idi-ko-tantaekenape-talangá*,—You were taking away those belonging to me and thee. *Hijúakanako-taleá*,—Ours have come.

ADJECTIVES.

Words restricted to the function of merely qualifying Nouns can hardly be said to exist in Mundari; for most of the words which denote qualities may, without undergoing a change of form, be used as Substantives, as Adjectives, or as Verbs, *v. gr.*, *Hende* means blackness, black, and to blacken. However, the differentiation of these Qualitatives into real Nouns, Adjectives, and Verbs has begun, as the following facts will show—

1st.—*Abstract Nouns* may, with a certain amount of liberty, be formed by inserting the Demonstrative *n* after the first vowel of the Qualitative and then repeating that vowel, *v. gr.*, *marang*, great; *ma-n-arang*, greatness.

This mode of obtaining Abstract Nouns presents no phonetic difficulties in any word, and it is certainly very simple. It is therefore both curious and characteristic that it is not used as freely by the Mundas as we might expect. Some words are thus transformed into Abstract Nouns rather freely, whereas others are never so used. Again, some individuals will occasionally have recourse to this formation in the case of certain words which other individuals will leave in their bare original form. I have several times remarked that a man very much concerned about a particular matter will use this abstract formation when speaking earnestly or anxiously about it, whereas in ordinary circumstances he himself as well as others neglects it altogether. So far, then, this formation resembles a real commodity for which there exists as yet no extensive demand.

It will be easily seen how widely this mode of evolving a vague root into a distinct Abstract Noun differs from the Aryan method.

2nd.—*Bugi* means, to be in good health, to be well, to make well, to cure, to be good. *Et'ka* means, to spoil, to be bad, to treat badly, to ill-use. These two words can no longer be used as Adjectives to qualify Nouns. To use them with that function, the Demonstrative *n* (*this*) must be suffixed: thus a good horse, *bugi-n sadom*; *literally*, good-*this* horse. A bad man, *et'ka-n horo*; *literally*, bad-*this* man.

REMARK.—When the Adjectives *bugin* and *et'kan* stand as Predicates, the Suffix *n* is dropped before the enclitic *ge*, *v. gr.*,—This horse is good, *Ne sadom bugin-ge*, or *ne sadom bugigeae*. This man is bad,—*Ne horo et'kan-ge* or *ne horo et'kageae*.

The only other formations bearing any analogy to the above are the *exceptional* Demonstrative Adjectives quoted above (page 26) where the

Personal and Impersonal Suffixes *i* and *a* are added to the ordinary Demonstrative Adjectives *ne*, *en*, *han* : *ni horo*, this man ; *literally*, this-*he* man instead of *ne horo*. *Hana buru*, yonder mountain ; *literally*, yonder-*it* mountain instead of *han buru*.

This manner of evolving a distinct Adjective out of the vague original forms *bugi*, *et'ka*, *ne*, *en*, *han* is analogous to the Aryan method of forming Adjectives.

The two methods just described yield, for the generic ideas of goodness and badness, the following real Parts of Speech :—

Verb	...	<i>Bugi</i>	...	to be well, to be good, to make well.
Adjective	...	<i>Bugin</i>	...	well (in good health), good.
Noun	...	<i>Bun-ugi</i>	...	goodness.
Verb	...	<i>Et'ka</i>	...	to be bad, to spoil, to treat badly.
Adjective	...	<i>Et'kan</i>	...	bad.
Noun	...	<i>enet'ka</i>	...	would be the form for <i>badness</i> , but I have never heard it used by any Munda.

3rd.—A somewhat more extensive mode of forming real Adjectives consists in adding the Possessive Suffix *ān* to words denoting animate or inanimate beings as well as qualities. These compounds are entirely restricted to the Adjective function. They denote possession—

Senṛaṇ, wisdom, discretion, to have attained the use of reason, to be wise, to have recourse to such or such an expedient, to excogitate something—*senṛaṇ-ān*, wise. *Taka*, a rupee, money ; *taka-ān horo*, a monied man. *Merom*, a goat ; *merom-ān horo*, a man possessed of goats, a man who possesses many goats.

4th.—The very same ideas may be expressed adjectively by means of a circumlocution containing the words *mená*, to have, and *banó*, not to have.

5th.—Many equivalents of our Adjectives are Perfect Participial forms, viz., the bare root-form *plus* the Perfect Tense-suffix *akan*. They are therefore analogous to such English Adjectives as *pointed*, *wounded*, etc.

Goja, a point, to point ; *goja-akan* sota, a pointed stick ; *gau*, wound, to wound ; *gau-akan* silib, a wounded deer ; *ol*, a scratch, a crack, a mark, to scratch, to crack, to mark, to write ; *ol-akan chatu*, a cracked waterpot.

A certain number of words denoting qualities are used adjectively with as well as without the Perfect Participial Suffix—

Ieser, to sharpen ; *leser katu* or *leserakan katu*, a sharp knife.

The Perfect Tense-suffix, however, may not be added indiscriminately to any word denoting quality. It is restricted to those cases in which the quality is known as the result of some work performed. It can therefore not be used to denote those natural qualities which are in no way the result of human skill or labour: thus *hende seta* means a black dog; *hendeakan seta* would imply that a dog of some other colour had been blackened artificially.

The Instrumental Suffix *te*, added to the Indeterminate Tense-forms *mená* and *banó* yields *menáte*, *banóte*. These forms are then transformed into real Adjectives by means of the Demonstrative Suffix *n*, *menáten* and *banóten*, v. gr., *Taka menáten hoꝛo*,—A man who has money, or a monied man. *Póé banóten sadom*,—A horse which has no defect, or a perfectly sound horse. Strictly speaking, Mundari did not stand in need of this formation; for the bare Indeterminate Tense-forms used participially express the idea perfectly: *Taka mená hoꝛo*,—The man who has money. *Póé banó sadom*,—A horse which has no defect. The Simple Participles are used as frequently at least as the Compounds *menáten* and *banóten*. The latter are therefore chiefly interesting as indicating a tendency towards the evolution of Parts of Speech. In meaning *menáten* and *banóten* resemble the phrases *provided with*, *versehen mit*, *pourvu de* and their contraries; but etymologically they differ widely from them.

DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

The formation of the *Comparative Degree* differs from that which obtains in European languages. It is analogous to the corresponding Hindustani formation. The *Adjective* or *Qualitative* denoting the excess takes no Suffix. The Noun or Pronoun denoting the term of comparison takes the Ablative Suffix, *ete*. Hence the sentence, *the elephant is bigger than the horse*, is rendered literally thus—From the horse the elephant is greater,—*Sadomete hati marangae*. I saw a beast bigger than a leopard,—*Sonchitáete marang jontuing lelnam-lia*.

The Superlative Degree has a double formation—

1st.—When it is desired to state the absolute excess of one or more particular beings over all the beings of the same species or genus, the Adjective *soben*, all, is placed before the term of comparison which stands in the *Ablative Case*. The Adjective remains unchanged,

v. gr., the elephant is the biggest animal,—*Soben jontukoote hati maranggede*; *literally*, from all animals the elephant is big or, among all animals, etc.

2nd.—Such Superlatives as are in English expressed by *very*, *exceedingly* are in Mundari rendered in two ways, viz.—

- (a) by affixing *uter*, *utterly*, *exceedingly* to the Qualificative, *v. gr.*,
marang, great; *maranguter*, very great;
- (b) by placing before the Qualitative one of the words: *isu*, *purá*,
isupurá, *kented'*, *mermer*, *betekan*.

Isu may be used with any kind of Qualitatives, just like the English *very*—*Isu bugin horo*, a very good man; *isu marang daru*, a very big tree. *Purá* is by preference used with Quantitatives. *Kented'* is used with Qualitatives denoting energy, power or violence. *Mer mer* is used with Qualitatives denoting qualities disagreeable to taste and smell, *v. gr.*, *mer mer haradá*. It is exceedingly bitter. *Betekan*, although evidently the Hindi word *betekān*, is in Mundari pronounced [*betěkhān*], and is synonymous with *isu*, *purá*, and *isupurá*. *Isupurá* is but an intensive form for *purá* and for *isu*. The Superlatives in *uter* seem to have been borrowed from the Sanskrit.

3rd.—Qualitatives denoting *dimensions* form their Superlatives by infixing the Consonant *p* after the first vowel and then repeating that vowel, *v. gr.*, *marang*, great; *ma-p-arang*, very great; *jiling*, long; *jī-p-iling*, very long; *moto*, thick; *mo-p-oto*, very thick.

This distinctly un-Aryan formation may be supposed to have applied formerly to all Qualitatives. Here, as on several other points, the Burjatic dialects offer a striking analogy with Mundari; for in them too the Superlative is formed by the insertion of *p* between the first vowel and its reduplication. The only difference being that they repeat the whole first syllable, *v. gr.*, *Sagan*, *sa-p-sagan*; whereas the Mundas repeat only the first vowel after the *p*.

EQUIVALENTS OF CONJUGATIONAL FORMS.

As stated in the Introduction, every Mundari word, no matter what its primary meaning or function may be, can be used to denote a state or action as referred to a Subject and thus become a functional equivalent of an Organic Verb.

The Organic *Infinitive Mood* has either a characteristic desinence or auxiliary Preposition of its own, *v. gr.*, ambula-*re*, all-*er*, geh-*en*, to go.

The Mundari Infinitive is never characterized by any Suffix or Prefix; it is always the bare root or the bare word-form—

- | | | |
|---|-----|---|
| <i>Buru</i> , a mountain : hence also | ... | (1) to heap up ; (2) to keep up certain feasts or to hold a fair (because they take place on mountains) ; (3) to call something a mountain. |
| <i>Soje</i> , straight : hence also | ... | (1) to straighten something ; (2) to go on straight ; (3) to call something straight. |
| <i>Gapa</i> , to-morrow | ... | (1) to put off to the next day, procrastinate ; to express by means of the word <i>gapa</i> . |
| <i>He</i> ! yes ! hence also | ... | (1) to answer in the affirmative ; (2) to agree to something ; (3) to grant something to some one. |
| <i>Hokaeabu</i> ! Let us cease : hence also | to | express by means of the word <i>hokaeabu</i> . |
| <i>Sim</i> , a fowl : hence also | ... | (1) to acquire a fowl ; (2) to kill a fowl for one's meal ; (3) to call something or some one a fowl. |

The Mundari Transitive or Intransitive Predicate differs very widely from the Organic Verb both in its material structure as well as in its functional capacity.

STRUCTURAL AND PHONETIC DIFFERENCES.

In the Organic Verb as well as in its Mundari equivalent we distinguish between the *primary* and the *formative* elements.

The *primary element* is that part which directly denotes the state or action.

It is generally called the *predicative* or the *attributive* root. This may in itself be simple or compound, *v. gr.*, in *go* and *forego*. If compound, it may consist either of two originally predicative roots or of a predicative and a demonstrative root, or even of two originally

demonstrative roots which by their conjunction have acquired a predicative or attributive meaning.

The *formative elements* comprise (1) all those roots or remnants of roots which have been added (prefixed, infixes or suffixed) to the primary element for the purpose of connoting Voice, Mood, and Tense; (2) the Personal Pronominal Subjects. These formative elements are generally *demonstrative roots*.

I.—Differences between the Primary elements.

Reduplication of the first syllable is used in Mundari as well as in Organic languages, chiefly to form Frequentatives or Intensives—

1st.—In Organic Verbs reduplication is frequently accompanied with phonetic changes, *v.gr.*, *φεύγω πέφυγα*; *do, dedi*. These changes may become very considerable, *qfr.*, the German languages where reduplication has caused the so-called apophony (Umlaut), *v.gr.*, *halten, to hold*; *hielt, held*, from a former reduplicated form, *hialt*.

In Mundari reduplication never causes any phonetic change in the syllable reduplicated, *v. gr.*, *dal*, to strike; *dadal*, to strike repeatedly.

2nd.—In Organic Verbs the reduplicated syllable has assumed the function of a purely formative element. It is used extensively to denote the *Perfect Tense*, as in the above Greek and Latin examples, or the *Past*, as in German and English.

In Mundari reduplication is strictly reserved to modify the meaning of the primary or attributive element. It can never serve to connote either Voice, Mood or Tense.

3rd.—In Organic Verbs the primary element is liable to phonetic changes even when there is no reduplication. To quote but two examples—(1) Strengthened and nasalized roots are weakened down to their original form when the Augment attracts the tonic accent, *v.gr.*, *φεύγω, έφυγον*; *λαμβάνω έλαβον*; (2) strong vowels descend the tonic scale before heavy accentuated syllables, *v. gr.*, *έμι, I go*; *ιμάς, thou goest*.

In *Mundari* the primary root remains perfectly unaltered through all the Voices, Moods, and Tenses, *v. gr.*, *dal-eaing*, I will strike; *dal-tanaing*, I am striking now; *dal-kedaing*, I struck; *dal-entanaing*, I strike myself; *dal-ôaing*, I will be struck.

II.—Differences between those formative elements which connote Voice, Mood, and Tense.

1st.—In *Organic Verbs* the formative elements are of three specifically distinct kinds, viz. (1) reduplication of the predicative or primary root; (2) auxiliary words which are traced back (a) to an original Substantive Verb, meaning to *be*; (b) to an original Verb, probably meaning to *will*, to *desire*; (3) purely demonstrative roots. These may be (a) *Prefixes* as some Augments; (b) *Suffixes*, *i.e.*, those which may be traced back to original Pronouns.

In *Mundari* all the formative elements connoting Voice, Mood, and Tense are *Suffixes*, and all of them are purely demonstrative roots, with the exception of the generic Imperfect Tense-suffix *taeken*, which is added to the ordinary Tense-suffixes.

2nd.—In *Organic Verbs* these formative elements have, so to say, no protection against phonetic decay: hence the need felt in modern languages to replace them by independent Auxiliaries, *v. gr.*, in English, to *have*, to *be*, to *will* and *may*.

In *Mundari* these elements are comparatively safe: hence independent Auxiliary Verbs do not exist. The whole work of denoting Voice, Mood, and Tense is done by means of demonstrative Suffixes to the primary root.

III.—Differences regarding the Pronominal Subjects.

1st.—In *Organic languages* the Pronominal Subjects have a fixed place: they are always Suffixes and have grown into the Verb-form to such an extent that they have dwindled down to mere desinences, having no longer a trace of meaning if considered by themselves alone. So severely have they been mutilated that even a desinence denoting the same Number and Person is not always identical in form through several Tenses, *cfr.*, *audio*, *audiebam*, *audivi*. Nevertheless, philology traces all of them back to a few original Pronouns: the Nominative theme—*aħa*; the Oblique Case-theme *ma*; the themes *tua* and *ta*, and the Reflexives *sma* and *swa*, variously combined, with occasional strengthenings

and vowel insertions or Demonstratives. Hence the need felt in Organic languages of having recourse to a separate set of current Personal Pronouns for use independently of Verbs. As this decay was carried on further and further, the modern Aryan languages had to use these current forms even in connection with Verbs, although traces of the Subjective Affixes be still existing here and there.

In *Mundari* the Pronominal Subjects to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates are still the current Pronouns of the language. In no sense can they be said to have grown into the Predicates. They are not even restricted to one particular position with regard to these Predicates as shown in the Chapter on Personal Pronouns (pages 12 and 13).

2nd.—In those Aryan languages which have resumed the current Personal Pronouns in connection with Verbs, these Pronouns may be replaced by Nouns or other Pronouns, *v. gr.*, *He* came. *The king* came.

In *Mundari* the Pronominal Subjects must always remain in immediate contact with Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, even though the Subject be denoted already by a Noun or by another Pronoun—*Hijùlena-e*, *he* comes. *Raja-e hijùlena* or *raja hijùlena-e*. The omission of the Pronominal Subjects in these cases would be, so to say, a barbarism in *Mundari*.

Raja hijùtana is quite as faulty in *Mundari* as the sentence *the king come* is in English. (The reason of this has been explained in the Introduction, from page xxxviii to xl.)

IV.—Differences regarding the number of formative elements.

1st.—The *Mundari* Transitive and Intransitive Predicates are always connected with the Subject by means of the Copula *á* (*a*). This *a* has a fixed place in the Predicate: it is suffixed to the Root *plus* Voice, Mood, and Tense-suffixes. It occupies in fact that place which the Pronominal Subjective desinences occupy in Organic Verbs: hence we must consider it as one of the formative elements.

Organic Verbs have no Copula. They add the Personal Pronominal desinences directly to the complete Predicate, *i.e.*, the Root *plus* Voice, Mood, and Tense-desinences.

2nd.—In *Mundari* Direct and Indirect Pronominal Objects are an essentially formative element of Transitive and Intransitive Predicates. When the Objects denote living beings, Personal Pronouns *must* be

inserted into the Predicates. Whenever no Pronoun is inserted it is understood that the Predicate either connotes an Inanimate Object or that it denotes a realized possibility. Thus *Lel-ko-tanaing*, I see them; *Leltanaing*, either I see *it* or *them* (the objects) or, I *can* see.

In *Organic languages* Direct and Indirect Objects are quite distinct from the Verbs. They are in no sense formative elements.

3rd.—Every *Mundari Transitive or Intransitive Predicate* is referred to its Subject by means of a link-word, viz., the Copula *á* (*a*). This Copula remains absolutely unchanged through all Voices, Moods, Tenses, Numbers, and Persons.

Organic Verbs always add the Pronominal Subjects directly to the Tense-form without a link-word. It is only in the more modern *Aryan languages* that link-words are used in certain Tenses, *v. gr.*, he *is* coming. But, then, that link-word is itself treated as a Verb and it adds the Pronominal Suffixes to the roots, *cf.*, *am*, *art*, *is*, *are*.

From what has been said so far, we see that every Tense of a *Mundari Transitive or Intransitive Predicate* constitutes a ground-form or scheme, in which not only the primary or predicative root, but also all the formative elements connoting Voice, Mood, and Tense remain unchanged through all Numbers and Persons. The Pronominal Subjects and Objects alone change.

Again, the formative elements of Voice, Mood, and Tense, so far as these are denoted by a special Suffix, have their places perfectly fixed in the compound. The Voice-sign stands first, the Mood-sign second, and the Tense-sign third, the Copula fourth: hence if we denote the Root or primary element by *R*, the Voice by *V*, the Mood by *M*, the Tense by *T*, and the Copula by *C*, we obtain for all actual Predicates the following general formula: $R + V + M + T + C$.

Of the formative functions, there are only four which are never denoted by a special Suffix, viz. (*1st*) the Active Voice, (*2nd*) the Indicative Mood, (*3rd*) the Imperative Mood, (*4th*) the Future and the Indeterminate Tenses (these two being identical in form).

If, therefore, the student has learnt by heart all the existing Voice, Mood, and Tense-suffixes and remembers where to affix or to insert the required Pronominal Subjects and Objects, his memory lesson is finished

for these Pronominal Subjects and Objects remain the same through all Voices, Moods, and Tenses for the same Person; thus, ko is both Subject and Direct Object in all Tenses.

By way of illustration I shall give here *in extenso* two Tenses—the Definite Present of the Active Voice and the Definite Present of the Passive Voice. In the Passive of course Direct and Indirect Objects are not inserted. To avoid the insertion of an explicit Object in the Active forms, I shall give that Tense as implying an inanimate Direct Object. Since the Active Voice and the Indicative Mood have no special Suffixes of their own, the columns under *V* and *M* remain blank in the first scheme and the column under *M* remains blank in the second—

<i>R.</i>	<i>V.</i>	<i>M.</i>	<i>T.</i>	<i>C.</i>	<i>S.</i>
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ing,</i>	I beat it now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- m,</i>	thou beatst it now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- e,</i>	he (she) beats it now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ...</i>	it beats it now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- lang,</i>	thou and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ling,</i>	he (she) and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ben,</i>	you two
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- king,</i>	both of them
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- bu,</i>	you and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- le,</i>	they and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- pe,</i>	you
<i>dal-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ko,</i>	they

} beat it now.

<i>R.</i>	<i>V.</i>	<i>M.</i>	<i>T.</i>	<i>C.</i>	<i>S.</i>
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ing,</i>	I am being beaten now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- m,</i>	thou art being beaten now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- e,</i>	he (she) is being beaten now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ...</i>	it is being beaten now.
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- lang,</i>	thou and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ling,</i>	he (she) and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ben,</i>	you two
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- king,</i>	both of them
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- bu,</i>	you and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- lo,</i>	they and I
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- pe,</i>	you
<i>dal-</i>	<i>ô-</i>	...	<i>tan-</i>	<i>a- ko,</i>	they

} are being beaten now.

Such a scheme is not hard to get by heart, but to correctly place the Pronominal Subjects and Objects as rapidly as conversation requires is immensely difficult for a foreigner. The difficulty is increased by the fact that the Pronominal Objects have two different positions in different Tenses, and the Pronominal Subjects may have three different positions as shown in the Chapter on Personal Pronouns.

In the Definite Present and the Definite Imperfect the Objects stand immediately before the Tense-suffix. In all other Tenses they stand immediately after the Tense-suffix. In the Imperfect Tenses they stand between the particular Tense-suffix and the Auxiliary Imperfect word *taeken*.

The Subjects too stand between the particular Tense-suffixes and the Auxiliary *taeken* in the Imperfect Tenses; but they are placed after the Objects. Thus, I was seeing them,—*Lel-jád-ko* (O.) *ing* (S.) *taekena*.

In all the other Tenses the Subjects are affixed to the word which immediately precedes the Predicate. If no word precedes, then they are suffixed to the Copula: hence, if we represent the Objects by O, the Subjects by S, and the Imperfect Tense-signs by T_1 and T_2 (the Auxiliary *taeken*), we obtain the following schemes:—

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Definite Present...} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} R+V+M+O+T+C+S \text{ or} \\ -S R+V+M+O+T+C. \end{array} \right. \\ \text{Other Tenses} & \dots \left\{ \begin{array}{l} R+V+M+T+O+C+S \\ -S R+V+M+T+O+C. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

The insertion of the Subjects between the principal Tense-suffix and the Auxiliary *taeken*, although so frequent as almost to constitute a general rule, is nevertheless not a necessity. They may be suffixed also to the word preceding the Predicate or to the Copula: hence each Imperfect is represented by a triple scheme—

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Definite Imperfect} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} R+V+M+O_1+T_1+S+T_2+C \text{ or} \\ R+V+M+O+T_1+T_2+C+S \text{ or} \\ -S R+V+M+O+T_1+T_2+C \end{array} \right. \\ \text{Other Imperfects} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} R+V+M+T_1+O+S+T_2+C \text{ or} \\ R+V+M+T_1+O+T_2+C+S \text{ or} \\ -S R+V+M+T_1+O+T_2+C. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

In *Organic Conjugation* we have a real combination or blending of primary and formative elements into a new word.

In *Mundari*, as the above schemes show, there is a mere agglutination of the primary and formative elements into a loose compound. The main tie keeping these elements together is their pronunciation as one word.

This structural difference between Organic Verbs and Mundari Transitive or Intransitive Predicates produces another, viz., a functional difference between them.

This functional difference must appear even more striking to an Aryan mind, because it leads to methods of thought-rendering that have no analogy in Aryan words or propositions.

Functional differences between Organic and Mundari Tense-forms.

The term *bare Tense-form* is here used to denote that part of any Transitive or Intransitive Predicate which denotes an action or state together with the circumstances of Voice, Mood, and Tense; hence it contains the primary root *plus* all those secondary elements which connote Voice, Mood, and Tense. Now, if this be applied to *Organic Verbs*, we find that they have only two parts, viz., (1st) the bare Tense-form, (2nd) the Pronominal Subjects; for here, with the exception of the Pronominal Subjects, every change in, or addition to, the primary root has been made to serve the purpose of connoting either Voice, or Mood, or Tense. But in the Mundari equivalents we find *three parts*, viz., (1st) the bare Tense-form; (2nd) the invariable *á* or *a*, which never connotes Voice, Mood, or Tense; (3rd) the Pronominal Subject.

By way of illustration compare the following Tenses of the Verb *to give* in Greek, English, and Mundari:—

1. <i>b. T. fr.</i>	2. <i>Pr. S.</i>	1. <i>Pr. S.</i>	2. <i>b. T. fr.</i>	1. <i>b. T. fr.</i>	2. 3. <i>Pr. S.</i>
δίδωμ	-μι	I	give.	omjad	-a- ing.
		I	am giving.	omtan	-a- ing.
δώσ	-ω	I	shall give.	om	-a- ing.
έδιδω	-ν	I	gavé.	omjad'taeken	-a- ing.
				omtantaeken	-a- ing.
δέδωκ	-α	I	have given.	omakad	-a- ing.

I. The bare Organic Tense-forms cease to have any current meaning as soon as they are severed from the Personal Pronominal Subjects. Thus the sounds *δίδω*, *δώσ*, *έδιδω*, and *δέδωκ* convey no meaning to the ordinary mind, no more do the English forms, *will give*, *gave*, etc. A defaced coin may still have the required weight, and will be accepted by a goldsmith and paid for according to the amount of precious metal it contains; but it is powerless as a buying agent in the general market: it is out of currency. Similarly, a bare Organic Tense-form will be recognized by the philologist as pregnant with meaning; but that meaning is, to the ordinary eye, quite latent. The form has no currency as a medium of exchange in the market of ideas.

In Mundari, on the contrary, the bare Tense-form is not something incomplete, requiring the addition of a new element to give it currency. Thus the forms *omtan*, *omjad*, *om*, *omakad* are all, by themselves alone, so many complete and perfectly intelligible Mundari words—

(1) Any such bare Tense-form is primarily an *Abstract Noun* denoting the action together with all the circumstances of Voice, Mood, and Tense.

When they perform the function of Nouns, these Tense-forms may of course take all those Postpositions of Case, Time, and Space which any ordinary Noun may take—

Olked denotes a past act of writing; *rá* is a Genitive Suffix denoting price.

Olked-rá gonong,—The price paid for a piece of writing done in the past.

Ol, besides denoting the act of writing in general, is also a Future, and thus signifies a piece of writing to be done in the future: hence—

Ol-rá gonong,—The price paid for a promised or future act of writing.

Oló is the Indeterminate and Future Passive: hence it denotes the act of being written, i.e., of having one's name written down or registered.

Oló-rá kukum,—The order of having one's name registered.

(2) The bare Mundari Tense-forms are Adjectives. As such, of course, they must be followed by a Noun; but, like the ordinary Adjectives, they never take Suffixes indicative of Gender or Number, *v. gr.*—

Olked' horo,—The man who wrote something.

Ol horo,—A man whose ordinary occupation is writing, or a man who is about to write something.

These forms remain Adjectives still, even when Direct or Indirect Pronominal Objects are inserted into them—

Olked'-ko horo,—The man who wrote *them* down, i.e., who registered their names.

Ol-aing dasi,—The servant who is generally writing for me, or the servant who is about to write *to me*.

(3) Instead of qualifying a Noun, these bare Tense-forms may qualify a Pronoun of the *Third Person*; but such Pronouns are always suffixed to the Tense-form; hence a Compound Noun is obtained. These Nouns are Nouns of Agency in the wider sense. They denote an Agent or a Sufferer according to the Voice of the form. Direct and Indirect Objects may be inserted into these Nouns just as into the Adjectives described under (2)—

Olked'-i,—The one who wrote; *olked'king*,—The two who wrote; *olked'-ko*,—Those who wrote.

Olked'ko-ní,—The one who wrote them; *olked'ko-king*,—The two who wrote them; *olked'koko*,—Those who wrote them.

(4) The bare Tense-forms considered as Nouns may take the Instrumental Suffix *ted*, and thus they yield Nouns of Instrumentality. These Nouns express *nuances* that cannot be expressed in English, except by rather long circumlocutions—

Ol-ted, writing materials, *i.e.*, pencils, pens, ink, and paper or slate.

Olken is the Simple Past of the Passive or the Intransitive Active Voice.

Ne chiti olken-ted,—The particular pen (and ink) with which this letter was written.

(5) The bare Tense-forms may take the Impersonal Pronoun *d* as Suffix. A euphonic *e* often precedes this *d*. This yields Concrete Nouns of two kinds, *viz.*—

(a) Nouns denoting the results of an action :—

Olked-d,—That *which some one has written*.

Olo-d,—That which is about to be written.

(b) Nouns denoting the material on which a certain action is to fall :—

Jom, to eat; *jom e-d*, that which is eaten, eatables, food; *her*, to sow; *her-e-d*, that which is sown, *viz.*, the grain, but in the Passive *hero-d*, that which is sown with the grain, *viz.*, land, fields.

Thus a man may say: *Hero-d do mená mendo heréd banod*,—I have fields, but no seeds.

II. The moment a bare Organic Tense-form is brought into contact with a Personal Pronominal desinence, or (in the case of modern languages) with a current Personal Pronoun, its latent meaning is brought out clearly; it becomes a perfectly intelligible word. But this word performs one function only—it is a *Verb*.

It cannot denote a state or action abstractly, but it must denote it as actually referred to this or that particular Subject or Agent.

Here attention is drawn to the fact that *reference* of the action to the agent is not *expressed*. There is nowhere a distinct word denotative of reference, nor is there even a remnant or trace of such a word. A real link-word or Copula, then, does not exist between the Transitive Predicate and its Subject. Language uses mere juxtaposition of the word denoting a state or action (the bare Tense-form) and the word denoting the agent (the Personal Pronoun either in full or as a

desinence) and leaves to the mind the task of referring the one to the other.

Thus, then, what the coinage does for the precious metals, the Personal Pronouns do for the bare Organic Tense-forms, inasmuch as they give currency to word-forms which would be meaningless without them. In this sense the Personal Pronouns, whether in their full or mutilated forms, enter as essentially constituent elements into the formation of Organic Transitive or Intransitive Predicates.

With the bare Mundari Tense-form the case is very different. Being by itself alone a current word with both Substantive and Adjective functions, it may take certain Suffixes to vary and multiply those functions, but it refuses direct contact with the Personal Pronominal Subjects. Were such a Pronominal Subject brought into direct contact with a bare Tense-form, that form would immediately lose all its current functions, and yet would not become a Transitive or Intransitive Predicate. It would simply be destroyed as a current word. The forms *omtan-ing*, *omjad-ling*, *om-le* are not propositions like the corresponding $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma$ - ω : they are simply meaningless. Hence the bare Mundari Tense-form is not like the bare Organic Tense-form, a ready-made Transitive or Intransitive Predicate, requiring only contact with a Personal Pronominal Subject to give it actuality and currency as such. In other words, it is not a *functional equivalent* of the bare Organic Tense-form.

What, then, is required to turn a bare Mundari Tense-form into a Transitive or an Intransitive Predicate?—The mere addition of the vowel *a*. The moment this *a* is suffixed, the bare Mundari Tense-form loses all its Substantive and Adjective functions and becomes a perfect functional equivalent of the bare Organic Tense-form. Thus, functionally—

omtan-a = $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu$, give; *om-a* = $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma$, will give.

omakad-a = $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa$, have given.

Like $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma$, and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa$, the forms *omtana*, *oma*, and *omakada* have no current meaning by themselves alone. Though they now have all that which on their part is required to be Transitive or Intransitive Predicates, they have not yet currency as such. Like their Organic equivalents, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma$, and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa$, they now require a complement; and this complement is the Personal Pronoun, and that Pronoun only.

Here, too, therefore the Personal Pronoun is that which gives the final touch to the Transitive or Intransitive Predicate: it is, so to say, the coinage which gives it currency—

Omtana-ing = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\mu\iota$,—I give.

Omtana-m = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\sigma$,—thou give-st.

Omtana-e = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\sigma\iota$,—he give-s.

Omtana-bu } = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$,— { you and I give.

Omtana-le } = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$,— { they and I give.

Omtana-pe = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\tau\epsilon$,—you give.

Omtana-ko = $\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\alpha\sigma\iota$,—they give.

Whereas in Greek and other ancient Aryan languages the very place of the Pronominal Subjects is unalterably fixed, the Mundari Subjects are bound only by the law of *immediate proximity* to the Transitive and Intransitive Predicates: hence the Mundari Pronominal Subjects may, as already stated, be suffixed either to the Predicate or to the word immediately preceding the Predicate: it may even, in the case of Imperfect Tenses, be infixed into the Predicate.

The *Simple* Personal Pronouns may also be replaced by the corresponding Emphatic compounds. These compounds must precede the Predicate—

Aing omtana, I give; *am omtana*, thou givest; *ae omtana*, he or she gives, etc.

The reason of this greater liberty of the Mundari Pronominal Subjects seems to lie solely in the fact that these Subjects are at the same time still the current Personal Pronouns of the language.

In English, where the Pronominal desinences have been lost except in the Second and Third Persons Singular, the current Personal Pronouns have been resumed for conjugational purposes.

Though they must, as a rule, precede the Predicate, they enjoy a privilege which even the Mundari Pronominal Subjects never have; for (a) they may in certain cases be separated from the Predicate by intervening words, *v. gr.*, *I always give*; (b) they may be left out altogether in the Third Person Singular and Plural, provided the proposition have a Noun or some Demonstrative Pronoun as Subject, *v. gr.*—

This one gives, these ones give; the king gives, the kings give.

The reason of this lies in the fact that the English mind still feels the effects of the formerly existing desinences, all the more because two of these survive in the Singular, just as the Roman mind fancied a Personal desinence somehow in the final *o* of the Present Indicative

Active, *v. gr.*, *lego*, though that desinence had long ceased to exist. But Mundari Predicates never have had any Personal desinences *grown* into them: hence the Mundari mind cannot conceive them as complete Predicates without connecting with them what he possesses in the line of Personal Pronouns, *i.e.*, the current forms. He therefore cannot possibly replace the Pronominal Subjects by a Substantive or a Demonstrative Pronoun. The proposition *Rajako omtana* will appear as barbarous to the Munda as, for instance, *Reges da* would have appeared to a Roman or as the proposition *the king give* would appear to an Englishman.

The Munda must always use a Personal Pronominal Subject together with a Substantive or a Demonstrative Pronominal Subject—

Ni omtana-e or *Ni-e omtana*, literally, this one give-*s* or this one he give.

Niku omtana-ko or *Niku-ko omtana*, literally, these ones give-*they* or these ones-*they* give.

Raja omtana-e or *Raja-e omtana*, literally, the king give-*s* or the king-*he* give.

Rajako omtana-ko or *Rajako-ko omtana*, literally, the kings give-*they* or the kings-*they* give.

The above brings out clearly the fact that in Mundari, as much as in the Aryan languages, the Personal Pronominal Subjects are an essential complement of every Transitive and Intransitive Predicate. But if the Personal Pronoun is the necessary and final complement of the Mundari as well as of the Organic Transitive or Intransitive Predicate, then what is the *a* which must be added to the bare Mundari Tense-form to render it capable of coming into direct contact with the Personal Pronoun, and which has no apparent equivalent in the Organic Conjugations?

Without this *a* words denoting states or forms of activity are either mere Abstract Nouns or Adjectives: with the *a* they are perfect functional equivalents of our Verbs. This *a* has not only the power of changing into Transitive or Intransitive Predicates Nouns which denote already states or actions, but it transforms into a Verb *any* and *every* Mundari word it happens to touch. Concrete Nouns denotative of living beings or inanimate objects, Pronouns, Numerals, Postpositions, Adverbs, Interjections,—all are changed into words denoting states or actions as referable and actually referred to some subject or agent the moment this *a* is suffixed to them. Even complete propositions are by it retransformed into compound words capable of standing as Transitive or Intransitive Predicates in a new proposition, *v. gr.*, *Hokala-e*, he

stopped; *Neado-le hokalée-a*. We express this by the word *hokalée* or we express this by saying *hokalée*. We might therefore call this *a* the verbalizing agent of the Mundari language. But then this name does not explain anything. The question immediately arises *Why* is it the verbalizing agent? Whence does it derive this power of verbalizing every word or proposition it touches? What does it mean, and what is its origin?

In the Introduction (page xliv) I stated that this *a* was in reality nothing else than the Impersonal Pronoun used with an Intransitive function. That statement can, I think, be proved by the following arguments:—

1st.—The genius of the language leaves to Mundari words the largest possible functional elasticity, and thus allows every word to perform the function of an Intransitive or a Transitive Predicate, according to the nature of the concept originally denoted by the words: hence the Impersonal Pronoun *a* may likewise assume an Intransitive function. Since *a* means *it* or *something*, it denotes being in general. If this concept be used intransitively, it can mean only two things, viz., either (1) *to be something* or (2) *to become something*.

2nd.—Mere Qualitatives or Adjectives are transformed into Nouns by means of the Suffix *a*, *v. gr.*, *pundi*, white; *pundiá*, something white or a white one (inanimate object). There is no doubt that in this case the Suffix *a* is the Impersonal Pronoun *it*. The compound literally means *a white something*; but the same form is used as a proposition and means also *it is white*, *v. gr.*, *Ne kagaj pundiá*,—This paper is white (*literally*, this paper a white-something). The word *a* is evidently the same in both expressions: only the *function* is different.

3rd.—Bare Tense-forms, *i.e.*, R + V + M + T are in Mundari mere Qualitatives or Adjectives. Now the addition of *a* to these Tense-forms transforms them into Nouns, just as Adjectives are transformed into Nouns, *v. gr.*, *lelakan* is the bare Perfect Tense-form, meaning *having been seen*: hence *lelakan-a* means *that which has been seen* (*literally*, a having been seen something or *visum quid*).

Here, again, the *a* is evidently the Impersonal Pronoun. But the same form may stand as Transitive Predicate to a Subject: *lelakana*, *it has been seen* (*literally*, a having been seen something (is) it). Here, again, the *a* appears obviously as the same identical Suffix, but the function it performs is different

4th.—That the *a* here under consideration cannot be considered as a mere phonetic *débris* of a former more complete root, but is in reality

the Impersonal Pronoun used intransitively seems proved beyond a doubt by the following fact. Mundari is much more particular in specifying the time to which an action belongs than any Organic language: hence the number of its Tense-forms—3 *Present Tenses*, 3 *Past Tenses*, a *Perfect Tense*, 2 *Future Tenses* and a *General or Indeterminate Tense*. To each of these corresponds an *Imperfect Tense*: hence 9 *Imperfects*. Besides this, it has its *Static*, *Inchoative*, and *Completive* forms. In all these Tenses, with the exception of two, viz., the *Simple Future* and the *Indeterminate Tense*, the particular time signified by the Tense-form is denoted by a special and very distinct *Tense-suffix*.

The absence of a special Tense-suffix in the Indeterminate Tense would be conceivable. That a form which is used only in cases where the mind deliberately abstracts from any particular *time* should be devoid of a special *time* or *Tense-suffix* would have nothing surprising. But that a language which uses as many as *three* distinct suffixes to denote the *Present* should have no suffix at all for the *Future* appears certainly very extraordinary at first sight. It is in fact *impossible* for the Munda mind in its present stage to denote an action as future without his being implicitly conscious that the idea of futurity is in some way expressed by one of the formative elements in the Predicate. Yet the Simple Mundari Future is invariably Root + Copula + Pronominal Subject in the Active Voice—I will or shall go,—*sen-a-ing*. They will come *hiju-á-ko*. In the other Voices the Future is R + V + C + S—I shall be seen,—*lel-ó-a-ing* (the *ó* is the Passive-Voice Suffix).

Now it cannot be maintained with a shadow of reason that *futurity* is in any way implied by the *root* of a Predicate, much less by the Pronominal Subject. Therefore, we must admit that the Munda mind sees or is implicitly conscious of futurity being implied by the Copula *á*, which is the only remaining element of the Predicate. Now, if we admit that the Copula *á* is really the Impersonal Pronoun *á* used intransitively, we shall find that this *á* really may imply futurity. Indeed, if the Impersonal Pronoun *it*, which directly denotes *being* in its vaguest sense as well as applied to a particular object, conceived merely in its most general or vaguest outlines, be used with an Intransitive function, it must mean either *to be* something or *to become* something. In other words, if the idea denoted by the Impersonal Pronoun be verbalized in Organic languages, it will yield the Verbs *to be* and *to become*—*sein* and *werden*, *être* and *devenir*, *esse* and *feri*. But the Verbs *to become*, *feri*, etc., necessarily imply a future time as opposed to present or realized

entity. If this view be admitted, the Mundari Future Tense finds a rational explanation. In that case we may say—in the Future Tense the Munda uses the Impersonal Pronoun intransitively in the sense of *becoming*. Since this necessarily implies futurity, and implies it in a manner of which the Munda mind is instinctively conscious, he does not feel the need of a separate Tense-suffix for the Future. Here, then, the Impersonal Pronoun serves at the same time as Copula and as Tense-sign: hence the proposition *sen-a-ing* can literally be translated into English by *going-become-I*; and *hiju-a-ko* means literally *coming-become-they*.

In all the other Tenses the Copula *á* is the Impersonal Pronoun used in its first meaning, viz., *to be*. Now, even as the Pronoun *it* makes abstraction of all particular specifications in the objects it may denote, so does the so-called Substantive Verb *to be* make abstraction of all particular times. In itself it only denotes being in its widest sense, whether real or purely ideal, past, present, or future. The bare root-form of any Verb does not imply any particular time: by itself alone it is indifferent to time. That Organic languages as well as a number of others use it without a special time affix to denote the present is indeed quite intelligible on the ground that when no particular time is mentioned, the speaker may naturally imply the present; but that implication does not lie in the root-form as such. This prescind from all time. The Mundas use the Intransitive Pronoun *á* as meaning *to be*, precisely in this most abstract sense: hence this Copula is, in this meaning, perfectly compatible with Present and Past Tense-suffixes. Considered in this light, all Mundari Tense-forms can be literally rendered into English as follows, where the Noun *being* is substituted for its synonym *it*—

Definite Present—*Hj'á-tan-a-ing*,—(A) coming-now-being-I.

Simple Past—*Sen-ken-a-ing*,—(A) going-then-being-I.

According to our organic habit of thinking, we feel the need of transforming the Pronoun *it* or *being* into a Verb and say—

Sentan-a-ing,—Going-now am I.

Senken-a-ing,—Going-then am I.

Here we further feel the need of tearing the Past Tense Suffix from the Predicate and throwing it into our link-word. Thus, we get, *going was I*, or *I was going*.

The Munda of course does not feel the need of any change in the form of his Copula. The element of time is attached to the root by means of a Tense-suffix, and the consciousness that the Personal Pronoun acts as Subject is sufficiently evoked by the immediate contact of the

Personal Pronoun with the compounds *sentan*, *senken*, etc. In reality we do radically the very same thing as the Mundas; for we too suffix our Pronouns to roots modified by whole or partial time-suffixes or modificatory elements. It is only the loss of the explicit consciousness of their original meaning which makes us attach something like a mysterious or living meaning to our Verb-forms. In fact, the Organic Conjugation is in its origin even more rudimentary than the Mundari equivalent; for whereas the Munda uses a link-word, we use none: *eo*, *is*, *it*, etc., is literally only the juxtaposition of root and Pronominal subject thus, *go I*, *go thou*, *go he*. But the Munda says: *go being I*, *go being thou*, *go being he*. The work of referring the attributive root to the Pronoun as to its Subject is entirely left to the mind. All that language does is juxtaposition, and thus it leads the mind of the listener to refer the juxtaposed elements to each other as *Predicate* and *Subject*.

From the above we see that the Kholarian translates the mind's working more closely than we do; for every concept standing as Predicate is really made up of a fasciculus of notes or features. Among these there is one which is necessarily common to all possible concepts, viz. that of *being*, whether *real* or *ideal*; this is, so to say, the foundation on which all our concepts are built up. The building up is done by superadding to this most vague and universal notion of entity other particular characteristics or features for the purpose of raising the vague idea of being to that degree of precision which the mind aims at in a particular concept.

But this is precisely what the Munda does in his spoken Predicates. He explicitly calls every Predicate *it* or *a something*; *a being*. And this *something* he specifies by adding to it roots denoting such characteristics as are there and then required. The order which he follows in adding these specifications is the same which he uses when specifying a Noun by means of Qualitatives, viz., the specifications precede the word specified. Just as he expresses the phrase—

A good and wise man,—*Bugin ad' seranan horo*,

so does he express the phrase—

Coming now,—

Hiju-tan *a* literally, *a coming-now being*. Hence, strictly speaking, this *a* is not precisely a *link-word* between the Subject and the Predicate. It is rather the common basis of all Accidental Predicates or the universal Predicate of Accidental propositions. And that compound which we call exclusively the Predicate, consists in reality only of those

specifications which are added to the common or universal Predicate as so many qualitative appositions or limitations.

The Aryan does not in his Predicate express the common element of all concepts. Taking it for granted that the listener's mind will supply that element, he translates into language only the particular features of his Predicative concept. This greater liberty with which he translates thought into language renders his Predicates, if less regular, a great deal lighter, and thus more handy for practical purposes.

Besides those structural differences between Organic Verbs and Mundari Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, which have been pointed out above, there exists still another which it seems preferable to explain immediately before entering on a detailed description of the Tense, Voice, and Mood-forms. *The flexional process* is not uniformly the same in even one and the same Organic languages. It is subdivided into several classes or Conjugations, the number of which varies from language to language. Thus all the Latin Verbs fall under four different Conjugations.

This division is based directly on the exigencies of those phonetic laws which regulate the blending of the primary and secondary elements of a verb into one word.

In Mundari the process by which the primary and the secondary or formative elements are agglutinated into one word remains uniformly the same. For (1) the formative elements are always the same; (2) the extent to which they submit to phonetic changes consequent on their subordination to the primary root never varies; hence if, for the sake of a name, we call the Mundari process *conjugation*, we should say that in Mundari there exists but *one Conjugation*. However, this Mundari Conjugation is subdivided into two constructions—the *Personal* and the *Impersonal construction*.—

I.—*The Personal Construction* is that in which the Subject is a *Personal* Pronoun. This Pronoun may occupy three different positions as explained above (pages 12 and 13).

II.—*The Impersonal Construction* is that which has the *Neuter* Pronoun *a* as Subject.

We too have Impersonal Verbs, but they do but partially coincide with the Mundari Impersonal Predicates. Thus, whereas we conceive the Subject of natural phenomena as *impersonal*, the Munda conceives it as *personal*. We say *it rains, it hails*, etc. The Munda says *he rains, gamajada-e; he hails, ariljada-e*, etc.

In Mundari the Impersonal Construction is limited to two kinds of words—

- 1st. Words denoting purely subjective states or affections, such as joy, grief, etc. (*confer* the Latin *poenitet me, taedet me, etc.*)
- 2nd. The so-called Substantive Verb *to be*, i.e., *to exist* or *to be present*, *mena*, and its contradictory *banó*, *not to exist* or *to be absent*.

In these two kinds of words the subject or being affected by joy, grief, etc., or the being of whom existence or non-existence is predicated is treated as an *inserted Pronominal Object*—

Hasu, sickness, pain: hence also, to pain. It will pain thee,—*hasu-ame-a*; it does pain thee,—*hasu-jad'-me-a*; it did pain thee,—*hasu-keð'-me-a*.

In the case of the first kind of words the Impersonal Construction is subject to certain limitations. In the case of *mena* and *banó* it is confined to the Present Tense. Full explanations on this point will be given further on.

The terms *Voice*, *Mood*, and *Tense* may be kept in the etymological description of Mundari Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, because they do not directly imply the *flexional* process of Conjugation.

The particular names of the various Voices, Moods, and Tenses may, with a few obvious modifications and additions, be kept also.

VOICE.

If we take the term *Voice* as denotative of a pure grammatical function, we may define it as the particular relation of *activity* or *receptivity* in which the Subject of a judgment stands to a Transitive or Intransitive Predicate.

The Subject may stand to such Predicates—

- (1) In the relation of an agent, *v.gr.*, *I see*. This relation is called the *Active Voice*.
- (2) It may stand to the Predicate in the relation of a *recipient*. In this case the Subject is in reality the terminus of an action performed by some one else, *v.gr.*, *I am seen*. This relation is called the *Passive Voice*.
- (3) The Subject may, in certain judgments, be conceived as both the agent and the recipient of an action, *v.gr.*, *I see myself*. This relation may be called the *Reflexive Voice*, the term

implying that the action is conceived as turning or falling back on the agent himself. It corresponds therefore to the Greek *Medium Voice*.

- (4) A Subject may denote two or more agents. These may, in certain judgments, be represented as reacting on each other, *i.e.*, as being at the same time with regard to each other agents and recipients of specifically the same action, *v.gr.*, *They see each other*. This relation may be called *the Reciprocal Voice*.

If now we consider the term *Voice* as directly applied to particular *word-forms* and only indirectly to the above functions or relations, we may define it as that form of a Transitive or an Intransitive Predicate which shows whether the Subject stands to the Predicate in the relation of activity, passivity, or of both activity and passivity.

Organic languages do not attach the relation of reciprocity to the Predicate form. That relation is expressed by the Reciprocal Pronouns standing outside the Predicate, *v.gr.*, by *each other* in the proposition,—*They see each other*. The relation of reflexivity too is in most of them detached from the Predicate and denoted by separate Reflexive Pronouns. Hence in most Organic languages Verbs have only two Voices—*the Active* and *the Passive*. In some we meet with three Voices—*the Active*, *the Passive*, and *the Reflexive* or *Medium*.

Mundari attaches all four of the relations described above to the Predicate. It has neither Reflexive nor Reciprocal Pronominal forms, and does not stand in need of them: hence here we have *four Voices*—*the Active*, *the Passive*, *the Reflexive*, and *the Reciprocal*.

MOODS.

Considered as a grammatical function, the term *Mood* may be defined as the connotation of the manner in which the mind conceives a judgment. Considered as a word-form, we may define it as that form of a Transitive or Intransitive Predicate which connotes the manner in which a proposition is uttered. A proposition may be uttered *assertively*, *imperatively*, *conditionally*, or *dubitatively*.

Mood-forms have been very unevenly developed even in languages of the same group. In Mundari we meet with five Moods—the *Indicative*, the *Imperative*, the ordinary *Precative* or *Concessive*, the *Polite Precative* or *Optative*, and the *Conditional*. The *Infinitive* cannot be called a Mundari Mood in the sense of the above definition. The

Conditional differs so radically from the other Mundari Moods that it can hardly be called a Mood at all; for in the clause which contains the condition, the Predicate is no longer connected with the Subject by means of the Copula, and thus it loses its character as a real Transitive or Intransitive Predicate.

Details concerning the Voices and Moods presuppose a full explanation of the Tense-forms, whose function consists in pointing out the time to which an action belongs.

The connotative functions of the Aryan Verb are limited to Voice, Mood, and Tense. To these functions the corresponding Mundari Predicates add, as stated in page 115 and 116, *Case* or the signification of Direct and Indirect Objects. Besides this, the Mundari Predicates possess another very characteristic feature, which is altogether wanting in our Verbs.

There exists, in the Active Voice of Transitive Predicates, a form which is neither a *Mood* nor a *Tense*. It cannot be called a Mood because the Suffix by which it is obtained does not imply the manner in which the proposition is uttered. It is not a Tense-form because the Suffix does not in any way connote time. It is obtained by suffixing *ta* to the root. It has a double connotation—

- (1) It may signify *the intention of the agent or the instigator of an action with regard to the effects of that action.*
- (2) It may signify *a particular state of mind in which the agent performed the action, viz., it implies that the act is or was done in spite of a custom or an order—*

Duar-ing niea means I shall open the door.

Duar-ing ni-ta means either (1) I shall open the door and *want it to remain open*, or (2) I will open the door, *happen what may, i.e., contrary to anybody's order or desire.*

This form occurs only in the *Indeterminate Tense*, as in the above example, in the *Simple Past* and in the *Imperative Mood*.

In the Simple Past the Tense-suffix *ked* drops the letters *k* and *e*, so that a Compound Suffix *tad* results, which stands for *ta-ked*—

Duar-ing ni-keda,—I opened the door.

Duar-ing ni-tada,—either (1) I opened the door and *left it ajar*, or (2) I did open the door, *notwithstanding any orders to the contrary or notwithstanding any apprehended consequences.*

Direct Pronominal Objects are inserted according to the general rules, thus—

Uriko-ing ader-ta-ko-a,—(1) I shall drive the cattle in and *shut them up*; or (2) I will drive the cattle in now, *though it be not yet time to do so*, or *though I have been told not to*.

Uriko-ing ader-tad'-ko-a,—I drove the cattle in and *shut them up* (so that they are even now inside), or I *did* drive the cattle in, *notwithstanding any custom or order to the contrary*.

This form would, from its nature, appear to be limited to Transitive Predicates, *i.e.*, such as do necessarily presuppose a Direct Object or a real direct terminus distinct from the agent. However, the second meaning which it conveys, *viz.*, that of a determination to act notwithstanding any moral or physical obstacles, allows its transfer to purely Intransitive Predicates, such as *sen*, to go; *nir*, to run, etc. Thus, for instance, the sentence—I kept on walking fast (notwithstanding my fatigue or the heat, etc.) may very adequately be rendered by *khub-ing sen-tada*.

This very peculiar form has been called *the Reservative* and *the Static*. Though neither of the terms be an exact designation of the function performed, the term *Static* will be kept in the subsequent pages.

Instead of placing it under a separate heading as distinct from *Voice*, *Mood*, and *Tense*, it will be classed with the Tenses, where it will figure as *Static Future* and *Static Past* respectively. The Imperative form will be classed as *Static Imperative*.

NOTE.—This is a very remarkable instance of the transfer of a meaning from the spheres of *time* and *space* to the purely *mental* and *moral* spheres. In the chapter on Postpositions it has been stated that *ta* denotes primarily *fixity* in space and *permanence* or *continuity* in time. Here we see the very same suffix used to denote (1) permanence or continuity of the effects of an action as *intended* by the agent (mental sphere); (2) fixity or firmness of *purpose* or *resolve* on the part of the agent to perform a certain action, notwithstanding any difficulties to the contrary (moral sphere).

TENSES.

The Active Voice and the Indicative Mood are not connoted by special Suffixes: hence Predicates consisting only of the root *plus* the Copula, *plus* the Subject, or of the root *plus* the Tense-suffix, *plus* the Copula, *plus* the Pronominal Subject, belong to the Indicative Mood of the Active Voice.

I.—The Indeterminate Tense.

We are in the habit of using a *Present* Tense-form to express certain actions or states which are not limited to the present time.

To this class belong (1) propositions stating general principles or universal truths; (2) propositions stating customs and habits not yet extinct, as well as regularly recurring actions and events.

To express these, the Mundas use no Suffix denotative of time, but subjoin the Copula *a* immediately to the Voice and Mood-form whenever no Pronominal Object is to be inserted. The first vowel of the root is lengthened.

If some Direct or Indirect Pronominal Object occur, then that is inserted between the Copula and the Voice and Mood-form.

This mode of expressing such statements is, in a way, more accurate than the use of a Present Tense-form, because the absence of any Suffix denotative of time is well calculated to imply that the statement makes abstraction of every particular time; that it holds good of the past, the present, and the future—

Hormo gojó-a, atma kae gojo-a,—The body dies, the spirit does not die. *Pormesor nel-bu-ae*,—God sees us (always). *Mundako heró dipli-ko bong-a-e-a*,—The Mundas offer a sacrifice at sowing time (a custom universally observed). *Orá chilekate-ko bai-e-a?* How are they in the habit of making (their) houses? *Garako urea enrege dáko dul-e-a enateko chapadea; chapad'kedchi en losod' pachri tapáteko idia*, etc.,—They first dig (a hole in the ground), into that they pour water and then knead (prepare the mud); having kneaded, they take that mud to build up the wall.

Bokomdo chikanmente kae taekena hature? Why was not your brother in the village? *Gupitee sen-a gomke*. He (always or usually) takes the cattle to graze, sir, i.e., that is his regular daily work.

Nea chikana-ko kajia? What do they call this? *Chandaea-ko*,—They call it *chandae* (the eaves of a roof). *Nea chikana-ko chika?* What are (people) using this for? What are they (generally) doing with this?

Words ending in a checked vowel insert a euphonic *e* before the Copula in the Indeterminate and the Future Tense. In this case the checked vowel is broken up into two distinct vowels, of which the first keeps a slight check, thus—

Ti, hand; *tii*, to take by the hand, to handle something, to lead or to take with one's own hand; *chó*, a kiss; *chóo*, to kiss; *kú*, cough; *kúu* to cough; *tii-e-a-ing*, *chóo-e-a-ing*, *kúu-e-a-ing*.

Intransitive Predicates ending in a consonant never insert this *e*—

Debel, to swim; *debel-a-ing*, *sen*, to go, *sen-a-ko*.

Transitive Predicates, no matter what their ending be, insert an *e* before the Copula whenever their *Direct Object* is an inanimate being.

Lel-e-aing,—I shall see it ; *harub'-e-a ko*,—They will cover it up.

Any word used with the meaning to call by such or such a word, to mean, to signify, to denote by such or such a word, refuses the insertion of *e* before the Copula, even if it end in a checked vowel—

Chikana-ko tia ? What do they mean by the word *tii* ? *Eni-ko kú-ua*—that they express by the word *kúu* (to cough). *Nea-le sirma-á*,—We call this *sirma* (a roof). But *nea-le sirma-e-a*,—We shall make a roof of this (i.e., of these materials).

II.—The Simple Future.

This Tense is, in its form, absolutely similar to the Indeterminate Tense. The difference of function assumed by the same word-form is explicable only on the supposition that here the Copula *á* means to become, and thus implies futurity; whereas in the Indeterminate Tense the Copula means to be in its widest and vaguest sense, and therefore applies to all times, the past, the present, and the future. Needless to say that the identity in form of two quite distinct tenses presents great difficulties to a foreigner. The fact that the Indeterminate Tense has no counterpart at all in Organic languages will naturally mislead him into using a Mundari Present Tense where he ought to use the Indeterminate form. The same fact will lead him to mistake for Futures the Indeterminate forms used by the Mundas until he has accustomed himself thoroughly to attribute to the context and the circumstances that amount of attention which in this as in many other constructions helps to fix the actual meaning of a proposition. Thus the sentence *En koṛa nete hijúae* may mean either that man *is in the habit of coming* here, or that man *will come* here. The lengthening of the first syllable in the Indeterminate Tense is generally not sufficiently pronounced to strike the foreigner easily.

For those who wish to acquire a practical knowledge of the language, it is absolutely necessary that they should, for some time, practise the insertion of all the Personal Direct and Indirect Objects into each of the three Persons in the Singular, Dual, and Plural. To give a complete scheme of all the possible insertions, even for a single Tense, is quite out of the question. For (1) the third Persons of the Singular, Dual, and Plural may take each eleven insertions: hence thirty-three different forms for the Indicative of these three

Persons only. Each of the eight remaining Persons take ten distinct insertions: hence eighty more forms.

The following schemes may serve as models to practise both the correct use of the Pronominal Subjects and the insertion of the Pronominal Objects. The learner may, *mutatis mutandis*, transfer them to all the other Tenses.

Scheme for practising the correct use of the Subjects together with the 3rd Person Plural inserted as Direct Object.

<i>Rá-ko-a-ing</i> , I shall call them.	<i>Gapa-ing</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	} I, thou, he, etc., etc., will call them to-morrow.
<i>Rá-ko-a-m</i> , thou wilt call them.	<i>Gapa-m</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-e</i> , he or she will call them.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
(<i>Rá-ko-a</i> , it will call them.)		
<i>Rá-ko-a-lang</i> , thou and I will call them.	<i>Gapa-lang</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-ling</i> , he or she and I " "	<i>Gapa-ling</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-ben</i> , you two " "	<i>Gapa-ben</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-king</i> , both or the two " "	<i>Gapa-king</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-bu</i> , you and I " "	<i>Gapa-bu</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-le</i> , they and I " "	<i>Gapa-le</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-pe</i> , you " "	<i>Gapa-pe</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-ko</i> , they " "	<i>Gapa-ko</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	

Scheme for practising the rapid insertion of all the Direct Objects into the 3rd Person Singular.

<i>Rá-iñ-a-e</i> , he or she will call me.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-iñ-a</i> ,	} To-morrow he or she will call me, thee, etc., etc.
<i>Rá-me-a-e</i> , " " " thee.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-me-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-i-a-e</i> , " " " him or her.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-i-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-lang-a-e</i> , " " " thee and me.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-lang a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ling-a-e</i> , " " " him or her and me.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-ling-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ben-a-e</i> , " " " you two.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-ben-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-king-a-e</i> , " " " both of them.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-king-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-bu-a-e</i> , " " " you and me.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-bu-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-le-a-e</i> , " " " them and me.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-le-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-pe-a-e</i> , " " " you.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-pe-a</i> ,	
<i>Rá-ko-a-e</i> , " " " them.	<i>Gapa-e</i> <i>rá-ko-a</i> ,	

In the first of the above schemes the Direct Object *ko* should be successively replaced by all the other Pronouns, whereas in the second scheme the Subject *e* should be replaced successively by the other Pronominal Subjects. In replacing the Subject *e* by other Pronouns, attention must be paid to the fact that where the Subject and Direct Object are one and the same person, the Active forms with Inserted Objects cannot be used. It must be replaced by the Reflexive forms:

This coincidence of Subject and Direct Objects happens always in the 1st and 2nd Persons, Singular, Dual, and Plural. I strike myself cannot be translated by *dal-iñ-a-ing*. It must be rendered by the Reflexive form *dal-en-a-ing*.

Similarly, thou striketh thyself is *dal-en-a-m*, not *dal-me-a-m*. He strikes himself is *dal-en-a-e*, not *dal-i-a-e*.

The form *dal-i-a-e* signifies that one third person strikes another third person.

In those Tenses in which the Indirect Pronominal Objects are preceded by *a*, the insertion of these Objects must be practised separately—

Kul-iñ ae, *kul-me-ae kul-i-ae*, etc., means he will send *me*, *thee*, *him*, etc., *kul-aiñ-ae*, *kul-ame-ae*, *kul ai-ae*, etc., means he will send (some one or something) *to me*, *to thee*, *to him*, etc.

Auri followed by a *Future Tense* is equivalent to the English phrases *not yet* or *not as yet* followed by a *Perfect* or a *Pluperfect*.

He has not yet returned,—*Aurie ruara*. At that time they had not yet surveyed the fields in these parts,—*En dipli nere ote auriko mukaea*.

III.—Static Future.

The formation and meaning of this compound has been explained above (pages 132 and 133).

Indirect Pronominal Objects are never inserted into the Static Future. *Direct* Objects stand between the Suffix *ta* and the Copula, *v.gr.*, I will sell off these horses,—*Ne sadomkoing akiring-ta-ko-a*.

When the Direct Object is an inanimate being (in which case no insertion is made), euphonic vowels are not interposed between the *a* of the Suffix and the Copula: hence these two *a*'s are in immediate contact. This contact produces a single long *á* with the check. Thus *ni-tá-ing*, *ni-tá-m*, *ni-tá-e*, *ni-tá-lang*, etc.,—I, thou, he or she, thou and I, etc., will set the door ajar.

Ta is rarely suffixed to Intransitive Predicates. If affixed, it changes them into Transitives, *v.gr.*, *Tising Ranchi jaked'ing sen-ta* means I will do the road from here to Ranchi to-day; I will traverse to-day the distance from here to Ranchi.

IV.—The Anterior Future.

It is formed by suffixing *le* to the root, and denotes the priority of one future action over another future action.

Transitive Predicates insert both Direct and Indirect Objects between *le* and the Copula. The Indirect Objects are, however, not

preceded by *a*, so that the context or the circumstances must decide whether in certain cases the Simple Pronouns stand as *Direct* or as *Indirect* Objects. Thus, for instance, *Om-le-ko-aing* may mean either I shall first give them (*v.gr.*, the horses) away to some one; or I shall first give it to them.

When the Pronouns *ing* or *i* stand inserted as Objects, the *e* of *le* elides with the *i* of *ing* and with *i*. The result is a long *ī*. In this elision the Pronoun *ī*, he or she, loses its check. Thus *Om-līā-ae*,—He will first give to me; *rā-lī-aing*,—I shall first call him or her.

N.B.—Great attention must be paid to the correct pronunciation of these two forms, because they differ from the Anterior Past only by the absence of the check on the *i*: *Rāliāae* means he first called me; *rāliāae* means he will first call me. *Rāliāe*,—He first called him or her; *rāliāe*,—He will first call him or her.

Le is not affixed as a mere Anterior Future Suffix to Intransitive Predicates, such as *sen*, *nir*, *hijū*, etc., in the Indicative Mood.

Intransitives form their Anterior Future in three different ways—

1st.—They may take the Suffix *kó* after the root. This Suffix generally performs the function of a Polite Precative or Optative, *v.gr.*, *Dub-kó-aing*? May I sit down, please? However, with Intransitive Predicates this function frequently disappears, and it is simply equivalent to the Future in *le* used in Transitive Predicates, *v.gr.*, *Oráteng sen-kó-a*,—I shall first go home; *Pittelang sen-kó-a*,—Let us (thee and me) go first to the market.

2nd.—The Simple Future Tense may be preceded by the Adverbs *sida* or *sidate*, first, *v.gr.*, *sida* or *sidate pittelang sena*,—Thou and I will first go to the market.

3rd.—The Adverb *sida* may be suffixed to the root just as *le* is suffixed in Transitive and *kó* in Intransitive Predicates, thus *Nir-sida-aing*,—I will first run; *Nir-sida-aem*,—Thou wilt first run.

This construction has, however, generally a different meaning: *Nirsida-aem*,—Thou wilt be the first to run away. Here no precedence of one action over another is implied. In this sense, therefore, the form is a Simple and not an Anterior Future.

In the case of Transitive Predicates too the above constructions with *sida*, *sidate* are freely used instead of the Anterior Future form in *le*. *Meromko har-sida-ko-aing*,—I shall first drive the goats away.

If *sida* be suffixed to the root, inserted Indirect Objects are not preceded by *a*:

Talab om-sida-ko-aing,—I shall first give the wages to them.

The form *sen-le-aing* is the only case in which I have ever heard the Suffix *le* used with an Intransitive Predicate in the Indicative Mood. On enquiring into the correctness and the meaning of *senleaing*, I was told by some of the more intelligent among correct speakers that the form is used, but that it does not mean *I shall first go*, but *I shall try to go*, *I shall attempt the distance*. In this phrase *sen* participates of the nature of a Transitive Predicate. I have further been assured that *le* cannot, even in this sense, be used with other Intransitives, such as *hijū*, *nār*, etc.

Le is used to denote the idea of attempting or trying ; but then it is followed by *k*, v.gr., *kuril-lek-aing*,—*I shall try to jump* (that height or length).

V.—The Definite Present.

THIS Tense is formed by suffixing *tan* to the root of both Transitive and Intransitive Predicates. Direct and Indirect Pronominal Objects are inserted between the root of the Predicate and the Suffix *tan*—

Rá-ing-tan-ae,—he is calling me. *Om-ako-tan-aing*,—I give to them.

When the Second Person Singular *me* is inserted into the Definite Present as *Indirect Object*, it frequently drops the final *e*—

Om-ame-tan-aing or *om-am-tan-aing*,—I am giving it to thee.

Similarly, the *e* of *me* may be dropped when *me* is inserted as *Direct Object* into words ending in *a*. *Rá-me-tanae* or *rā-m-tanae*,—he calls thee.

VI.—The Indefinite Present.

It is formed by suffixing *jad* to the root of the Predicate.

Direct and Indirect Objects are inserted between the Tense-suffix and the Copula.

Indirect Objects are never preceded by *a*, so that the context and the circumstances must decide whether an inserted Pronoun stands then and there as *Direct* or as *Indirect Object*.

The *d* of *jad* is checked whenever the inserted Pronoun begins with a Consonant—*Lel-jad'-meaing*, *lel-jad'-lingae*.

Before the Pronouns *ing* and *i* the *a* is dropped altogether, and the *a* of *jad* is checked.—*Lel-já-iñae*, *lel-já-i-aing*.

Concerning the use of Indirect Objects with this Tense, the following rules should be observed:—

Words denoting *to give*, *to lend*, and their synonyms generally insert their Indirect Objects, *v.gr.*, *Takaing paincha-jad'-ko-a*,—I am lending money to them; *kami-e om-jad'-le-a*,—He is giving work to us.

Words denoting *to bring*, *to take*, *to carry*, and their synonyms generally do not insert Indirect Objects. The Object stands outside the Predicate with the Suffixes *táte* or *táre* according to the nature of the case. Hence (a) when the Indirect Object is a living being, denoted by a Noun, no Pronominal Object is used at all, *v.gr.*, I take this to thy brother,—*Nea bokom-táteng idijada*: never *Nea bokom-táteng idijáa*; (b) when the Indirect Object is a Personal Pronoun, then the emphatic form with the required Suffix stands out of the Predicate—I take this to them,—*Nea ako-tateng idijada*.

3. Indirect Objects to most other words stand out of the Predicate with the Postposition *nagente* and synonyms (see pages 61 and 63)—*Ne loeong de menteng si-jada*,—I plough this field for him.

Distinction between the Definite and the Indefinite Present.

The grammatical Present may be conceived in two ways: (1) an action may be conceived as actually going on at the present moment, *i.e.*, as belonging to the present in the strict and narrow sense of the word. (2) It may be conceived as going on or continuing, with such interruptions as circumstances may require, through that vaguely defined portion of time which we call the present in the wider sense of the word. The terms *Definite Present* and *Indefinite Present* would accurately designate these two modes of conceiving present actions. In Mundari grammar these terms, however, cannot be limited to this meaning.

The correct use of these two Tenses is difficult for a foreigner. Even an accurate description of their respective functions is not easy. For the functions are based on two distinct principles, viz, first and mainly on the manner in which the action itself is conceived, independently of the element of time, and only secondarily and exceptionally on the manner in which the present time is conceived.

If an action is conceived exclusively as a modification of the agent, it is, grammatically speaking, intransitive. This mode of conceiving

may be extended even to those forms of activity which in reality must have an effect or terminus distinct from and out of the agent.

If, on the contrary, the mind considers an action both as a modification of the agent and as having an effect or terminus out of the agent, it is called transitive. It is these two modes of conception, the Munda mind adheres to throughout, and he expresses them in language by distinct Suffixes.

All Tense-suffixes ending in *n* are primarily *Intransitive Suffixes*; those ending in *d* are primarily *Transitive Suffixes*.

As a general rule, the Munda does not distinguish between the *present moment* in the narrow or strict sense and the *present time* in the loose or wide sense. A thorough-going distinction therefore between a *Definite* and an *Indefinite Present* as defined above does not exist in Mundari grammar.

So far as the element of time is concerned, there is, generally speaking, but one *Present Tense* in Mundari. This Tense abstracts from the stricter and the wider present: it embraces both of these without particularly insisting on either. Hence the following rules:—

1st.—The Suffix *tan* serves to form the *Present Tense* of *Intransitive Predicates*.

2nd.—The Suffix *jad* serves to form the *Present Tense* of *Transitive Predicates*.

Kamitanae may mean, He is working just now, or he has work these days.

3rd.—When it is desired or necessary to point out that a *Transitive action* which is then and there conceived transitively is actually going on at the present moment, the Suffix *tan* must be used. In this case Direct and Indirect Objects denoting living beings must be inserted into the Predicate. The following example was given by a servant as an illustration of this rule: I and another servant stand near a table on which money is lying, and you, sir, are sitting at a distance. The other servant whispers to me: "Take one of those rupees." But you happen to be just then looking at me. So I whisper back: "I can't: the master is seeing me,"—*Kaing daria; gomkee lel-ing-tana*.

Do you see those two birds? No, I don't. I suppose they have now disappeared behind the leaves. Not a bit! there they are; I see them still,—*En ohenreking leljad'kingam chi? Kaing leljad'kinga; sakam-kôre danangjanakingja. Kage! mendakogea: naöing lel-king-tana*. Here the Predicate *leljad'kinga* is in both instances a *Definite Present*. But since no stress is so far laid on the exact moment, the ordinary

Transitive Present forms are used ; but in the last sentence the Suffix *tan* must be used because the speaker desires to point out the exact or strict present moment.

This is the only case in which *tan* is used instead of *jad* for the particular purpose of obtaining a real *Definite Present* form.

In those parts where the Hindus and Uraons have not yet settled, and where the Mundas know and speak only Mundari, *jad* is hardly ever suffixed to Intransitive Predicates. It is in fact so rare that it may safely be considered as a mistake. I have been told by several of the best speakers that such forms as *senjadaing*, *nirjadaing* are used only by foreigners who do not know Mundari properly and by the Mundas who live among Hindus and Uraons.

Frequently the context will show whether this Tense-form is there and then performing the function of a strict Definite or a strict Indefinite Present in the case of Intransitive Predicates—

v. gr., My elder brother is not at home now ; he works at the road,—
Bauing bangāta, horare kamitanae (Def. Pres.).

What are you doing these days?—I am working at the road,—
Chikanam chikatana tising gapa ? Horareng kamitana. (Here *chikanam* and *kamitanaing* are both *Indefinite Presents*.)

A man looking on at a carpenter engaged on some particular work, but not understanding what sort of implement or furniture he is making will ask : *Ohikanam baijada ?*—What are you making ? The carpenter answers : *Kirking baijada*,—I am making a window. Here *baijada* is twice used as a *Definite Transitive Present*.

So far all is easy and simple enough. The difficulty lies in the following rules :—

4th.—The Suffix *tan* must be used with *Transitive Predicates* whenever the speaker makes abstraction of the outward effect or terminus of the action in question, and considers it only in so far as it affects the agent. In that case Pronominal Direct and Indirect Objects (denotative of living beings) are not inserted into the Tense-form if these Objects occur as Nouns or Independent Pronouns in the sentence :

What art thou doing in this place ? (What is your occupation or work here these days?),—I am teaching the children of the village,—
Nere chikanam chikatana tising gape ? Haturen honkoing itutana. (Here both Predicates are *Indefinite Presents*, and the Transitive word *itu*, to teach, does not take a Pronominal Object.)

Why is your brother not at home? Where is he just now? He is grazing the cattle,—*Baum chikanamente bangáia? okortu nado? Urikoe gupitana.* Here *gupitana* is a *Definite Present*.

VII.—The Continuative Present.

It is formed by suffixing the transitive Perfect Tense suffix *akad* to both Transitive and Intransitive Predicates.

The intransitive Suffix *akan* is used only with those Intransitives which denote rest or stillness, such as *tingun*, to stand; *dub*, to sit; *giti*, to lie down; *hapen*, to keep silence, and their synonyms. Direct and Indirect Pronominal Objects stand between the Suffix *akad* and the Copula. Indirect Objects are not preceded by *a*.

The phonetic changes are the same as those indicated in the Transitive Present, in *jad*, p. p. 139 and 140.

It frequently takes the emphatic *ge*, which stands immediately before the Copula: *Sen-akad'-ge-ae*,—he keeps on walking or going; *Lel-a-kad'-ko-ge-ae*, he keeps looking at them; *Tingu-akan-ge-ae*,—he continues standing all the while; *hape-akan-ge-ae*,—he persistently keeps silent.

The Continuative Present implies that an action already begun will or must be continued *uninterruptedly* through the Present into the Future until certain circumstances or explicit orders cause it to cease. It is of course chiefly used in the Imperative Mood.

N.B.—The uninterrupted continuity here spoken of may apply either to numerically the same act or to numerically distinct acts of a homogeneous series. In the first case the continuative Present denotes a physical continuity of one and the same act, *v.gr.*—*goakad'geaing*, I keep carrying it, *i.e.*, I have never put it down for an instant. In the second case it denotes a morally uninterrupted continuity, and implies that each time an occasion presents itself for performing an act belonging to the series, that occasion will or may not be missed, *v.gr.*, They still continue killing everyone who enters their country: *Náo akod disumre bolotanko goakad'kogeako*.

VIII.—The Simple Past.

It is formed by suffixing *ken* to Intransitive and *ked* to Transitive Predicates. *Sen-ken-aing*, I went; *lel-ked-aing*, I saw it.

Direct Pronominal Objects are inserted between the Suffix *ked* and the Copula.

When the Pronouns *ing* or *i* stand as Direct Objects, the consonant *d* of *ked* is dropped and the *e* elides with *i* of *ing* or with *i*. This elision causes the *i* of *ing* to be checked; hence the forms—

Lel-kĩñ-ako, they saw me, instead of *lel-ked-iñ-ako*.

Lel-ki-ako, they saw him, instead of *lel-ked-i-ako*.

These strong elisions are limited to the Mankipati districts. In other places the complete forms are current.

When Indirect Objects are inserted, the Simple Past is so different in appearance that it would seem quite unconnected with the form in *ked*—

<i>Om-āiñ-ae</i> or	} He gave it to me,	<i>Om-ad'-ling-ae,</i>	He gave it to him and me.
<i>Om-ad'-iñ-ae,</i>		<i>Om-ad'-ben-ae,</i>	He gave it to you two.
<i>Om-ad'-me-ae,</i>	He gave it to thee,	<i>Om-ad'-king-ae,</i>	He gave it to both of them.
<i>Om-āi-ae,</i>	} He gave it to him	<i>Om-ad'-bu-ae,</i>	He gave it to you and me.
<i>Om-ad'-i-ae,</i>		<i>Om-ad'-le-ae,</i>	He gave it to them and me.
<i>Om-ad'-lang-ae,</i>	He gave it thee	<i>Om-ad'-pe-ae,</i>	He gave it to you.
	and me,	<i>Om-ad'-ko-ae,</i>	He gave it to them.

A plausible reason why a distinct Tense-suffix should have been adopted in the case of Indirect Pronominal Objects cannot be assigned. The explanation given in the Introduction [page li (2)] shows, I think, conclusively that *ked* is the basis of the above forms. I there assume that the *a* which introduces Indirect Pronominal Objects, has, in this Tense, been placed before the Suffix *ked*, whereas the Pronoun follows the Suffix: thus *om-a-ked-iñ-ae*. The instinctive hurry to hasten from the *a* to its natural complement, the Pronoun, caused the two first letters of *ked* to be dropped, thus producing the forms *om-a-d-iñ-ae*, *om-a-d'-me-ae*, *om-a-d-i-ae*, etc. In the Mankipati district the forms *om-ad-iñ-ae* and *om-ad-i-ae* were then further contracted into *om-ā-iñ-ae* and *om-ā-i-ae*. In these two contractions the disappearance of the consonant *d* caused the *a* to be checked. This check reacting on the Pronoun *i* reduces it to an unchecked vowel *i*.

This Tense is called here the *Simple Past*, because it simply represents the action as a past one without any further implication or connotation.

IX.—The Incomplete Past.

This Tense signifies that an action has been interrupted or broken off before it was completed. It generally implies an intention of resuming and completing the action. By its very nature it is mainly limited to *Transitive Predicates*.

It is formed by suffixing *ken* to the root. Pronominal Objects are not inserted. The reason is because in this form the subjective element of the action is insisted on: in other words, the action is considered primarily as a past modification of the agent: hence it becomes virtually Intransitive. The form is often correctly rendered by the English

phrase, *to have been busy doing this or that*—*Enangsanj mad'ing má-kena*,—This morning I have been busy cutting bamboos (but I have not cut as many as I intend to cut). *En loeongem siakada?* Hast thou ploughed that rice-field? *Sidoing si-kena, auring chabaea*,—I have been busy ploughing, but I have not finished it yet.

X.—The Anterior Past.

This Tense denotes the priority of one past action over another. It is formed by suffixing *len* to Intransitive and *led* to Transitive Predicates.

Pronominal Objects are inserted between the Suffix *led* and the Copula. Indirect Objects are not preceded by *a*.

When *ing* or *i* are inserted as Objects, the same elisions take place which have been described in the Simple Past Tense. Hence the forms *Lel-lñae* for *lel-led-iñ-ae*,—He first saw me, and *Lel-li-ae* for *lel-led-i-ae*,—He first saw him.

A very strong contraction takes place when the Direct Object is inanimate, in which case Personal Pronouns are not inserted. The complete form is *lel-led-aing*,—I first saw it or them (inanimate objects). In the Mankipati district the *ed* of *led* is dropped, the Copula is checked and immediately suffixed to the *i*: hence the forms—

Lel-lá-ing, I saw it (them i.o.) first.

Lel-lám, Thou sawest, etc.

Lel-láe, He or she saw, etc.

Lel-lálang, Thou and I saw it first.

Lel-láling, He or she and I, etc.

Lel-lá-ben, You two, etc., etc.

REMARK —When there is question of one agent having performed a certain action before another agent performed the same action, the Anterior Past is not used, because this form denotes the priority of one past action over some other past action. In that case *aiar* or *sida* are suffixed to the root and followed by the Simple Past Suffixes *ken* or *ked* or some other Past Suffix. He was the first to run away,—*A'ege níratarjanae*. I was the first to see these birds,—*Aing ne cheprekoing lelsidaked'koaing*.

The words *hijá*, to come, and *jonomb*, to be born, always form their *Simple Past* in *len*. The forms *hijá-kenaing hijá-kenam*, etc., are never heard from the Mundas themselves.

One frequently hears the Anterior Past used in cases where the real function of this Tense would not justify its use. The following may be accepted as a correct general rule or description of the Mundas' practice:—

Whenever there is really question of the priority of one past action over another, the Mundas invariably use the Anterior Past Tense form. In other cases they use it rather frequently instead of the *Simple Past*.

XI.—The Static Past.

It is limited to Transitive Predicates, and is formed by suffixing *tad* to the root.

Pronominal Objects stand between the Suffix and the Copula. Indirect Objects are not preceded by *a*. The elisions described in the Simple Past take place here too when the Pronouns *ing* or *i* are inserted as Objects: hence the forms *tol-tā-iñ-ae* for *tol-tad-iñ-ae*, and *tol-tā-i-ae* for *tol-tad-i-ae*.

What has been said above concerning the double function or meaning of the Static Future applies also to the Static Past—

<i>Duare nitada</i> means	{	either, He has opened the door and left it open;
		or, He opened the door, although he ought not to have done so.
<i>Uriko-ing adertad'-koa</i> means	{	either, I drove the cattle in and they are still in the stable; or,
		I drove the cattle in before the proper time or against orders.

XII.—The Perfect Tense.

It is formed by suffixing *akan* to Intransitive and *akad* to Transitive Predicates.

Pronominal Objects stand between the Suffix *akad* and the Copula. Indirect Objects are not preceded by *a*. The elisions described in the Simple Past take place here too when *ing* and *i* stand as Objects: hence the forms *Lel-akā-iñ-ae*,—He has seen me, and *Lel-akā-i-ae*,—He has seen him or her.

The Perfect Tense directly signifies that an action is completed, and it implies that the effects or the state brought about by that action are continuing still. In other words, the Perfect Tense points out the present effects of a past and completed action.

The Mundas adhere strictly to the function of the Perfect as here defined. This gives rise to certain idiomatic expressions in which particular Perfect forms are used where we would expect the Indeterminate Tense of *ituanaiing*, I know; *ituanam*, thou knowest, etc.—

En hore lel-akāiaing,—I know that man; *Kaing lel-akad'-koa*,—I do not know them; *En hora kaing senakana*,—I do not know that road; *Ama bharom kaing idi daria go kaing hewa-akana*,—I cannot take your luggage (load), I am not accustomed to carrying, *i.e.*, my shoulders are not hardened by having carried loads; *En jó chiulao kaing jomakada*,—I do not know how that fruit tastes (because I have never eaten any of it).

In the above and similar sentences Mundas use the Perfect Tense of certain Predicates in order to directly denote the effects or the state brought about by the actions signified.

The difference between the Perfect Tense and the Static Past may be defined as follows:—

The Perfect Tense is the simple statement of an accomplished fact with the accompanying connotation that the effects of the action are lasting as a matter of fact. It connotes nothing respecting the *intention* or the *state of mind of the agent*.

The Static Past, on the contrary, connotes or rather primarily denotes the *intention* or the *state of mind of the agent*.

The Perfect is a Tense-form in the strict sense of the term. The Static Past, on the contrary, is, so far as *ta* is concerned, rather a modification of the Predicate's meaning.

XIII.—The Indefinite Past.

The Suffix *jan* is used with some *Intransitive Predicates* to form a Past Tense which may in a certain sense be called *Indefinite Past*. However, the name is not very accurate, and is used here chiefly for want of a better one. In the Active Voice the Past in *jan* is limited to *sen*, to go; *nir*, to run away; *apir*, to fly away; *hoka*, to cease, to stop. It implies that the being denoted by the Subject to these Predicates went, ran or flew away and is not yet returned, or that an action has been stopped for the moment and has not yet been resumed, though the intention of resuming it exist.

Example.—*Hokajanale dá go*,—We have, for the present, stopped carrying water. It differs from the Perfect, inasmuch as that Tense primarily denotes the definite or permanent absence brought about by the past acts of going, running or flying away, whereas the Indefinite Past does not imply a permanent absence. It simply connotes that so far the being signified by the Subject has not yet returned.

Okoria Soma? Nirjanæ,—Where is Soma? He has run away (*v. gr.*, for fear of being scolded by you he ran away, just to avoid meeting you).

Nirakanæ,—He is no longer here, *i.e.*, he has run away from this place definitively and does not seem to intend returning.

In narrations too this Indefinite Tense is generally used, *v. gr.*—

Enatedo tuin rurajanæ aea orátè oro inioe senójana,—Then the fox returned home to his own house and he too (the stork) went home.

The Simple Past in *ken* is used only in enquiries or statements concerning a matter of fact, *v. gr.*, I told Soma to go to Ranchi. Did he (really) go? Yes, sir, he did go. *Ranchite senme mente Somaing kajila. Chia senkenæ? He, gomke, senkenæ.* If this question be

answered by *senjanae*, it would imply that he did go, and is not yet back.

Second function.—*Jan* is suffixed to both Transitive and Intransitive Predicates to signify that the Subject or Agent *went* to do a certain work or *began* some action, and that he has not yet completed or discontinued it : hence in English this very peculiar Tense-form must generally be rendered either by the Past of the Verb *to begin* or *to go*, followed by an Infinitive or a Participial Clause.

Transitive Predicates never insert Pronominal Objects in this form—

Durang-jan-ae, he *began* to sing ; *Rá-jan-ae*, he *began* to cry. *Inung-jan-ae*, he is *gone* to play ; *susun-jan-ae*, he is *gone* to dance ; *sendera-jan-ae*, he is *gone* hunting ; *siú-jan-ae*, he is *gone* to plough. *Mad'e má-jan-a*, he is *gone* to cut bamboos ; *Uriko-e gupi-jan-a*, he is *gone* to graze the cattle ; *Haiko-e sab-jan-a*, he is *gone* to catch fish.

When *jan* is suffixed to *hoka*, to cease, to stop, it implies that a certain action is discontinued for the moment, though it be not definitively broken off or given up altogether.

Daru pataule hokajana,—We have (for the moment) stopped watering the trees.

The Perfect Tense, on the contrary, implies the complete giving up of the action. *Ne daru patau nadole hoka-akada*,—We have now stopped watering this tree (because it does no more require it, it has taken root).

THE IMPERFECT TENSES.

To nearly each of the Tenses described so far there corresponds an Imperfect Tense. All these Imperfects are formed by adding *taeken* (seldom *taenken*) to the original complete Tense-form, so that the generic Imperfect Tense-suffix always stands immediately before the Copula, *v.gr.*, *sentan-taeken-a-ing*,—I was going then. *Inungled-taeken-a-ko*,—They had been playing.

The Imperfect Tense-suffix never affects the position of the inserted Pronominal Objects. These remain in the positions pointed out above ; nor does it interfere with any of the elisions described in the Indefinite Present, the Simple Past, etc. But this Suffix or rather Auxiliary does affect the position of the Pronominal Subjects. As a general rule the Mundas place the Pronominal Subjects immediately before *taeken*—

Sentan-ing-taekena, seldom : *santan-taeken-a-ing*.

Inungled'-ko-taekena, seldom : *inungled'-taeken-a-ko*.

Hence in those Tenses which insert the Pronominal Objects after the Tense-suffix, we have in the corresponding Imperfects two Pronouns standing side by side before the Auxiliary *taeken*; the first of these being a Direct or Indirect Object and the second the Pronominal Subject—

Leljad'-ko-ing-taeken-a, I was seeing them at the time; *Haiko sabled' ko-le-taeken-a*,—We had just been catching fish.

With regard to function, it may be said in general that the Auxiliary *taeken* does not change anything either in the denotation or connotation of the original Tense-forms. All it does with regard to them is this: it transfers them into the past time, and there assigns to them in relation to some past fact that particular position in time which the original Tense-form implies.

XIV.—The Indeterminate Imperfect.

One of the functions of the Indeterminate Tense is to state universal truths, first principles or axioms. This particular function has of course no Imperfect.

Another function of the original Tense is to state customs not yet extinct or habits not given up, etc. This function has an Imperfect Tense.

Taeken added to the Indeterminate Tense represents as having existed formerly customs now extinct, habits now given up, occupations performed regularly at one time, but abandoned now.

Before the English arrived in our country the Mundas were in the habit of burning wizards and witches alive: *Aled disumre Angrajiko auriko hijure Mundako najomko jid'jid'ge-ko* (Subj.) *atar-ko-taekena. Hen diplio si-ko-taekena*,—At that (remote) time too they were ploughing, *i.e.*, they performed the work of cultivators.

In the Active Voice there is no Imperfect corresponding to any of the three Future Tenses. The Imperfect form of the Transitive or Definite Present is commonly used to express the idea that some past action was on the point of being performed when the main event narrated took place.

However, when it is desired to insist on the idea of a futurity of a past action relatively to another, the following circumlocution is used which renders the difference between the Simple, the Anterior, and the Static Future to a nicety. In this circumlocution the original

Tense-forms occur in Direct-speech form, whereas the Auxiliary *taeken* is added to words meaning *to intend, to say* :—

Ex.—He was on the point of going to Ranchi when his wife fell sick, becomes *I shall go* to Ranchi, saying he *had intended*, but then his wife fell sick : *Ranchiteng sena mente moneakade taekena, entedo kuritae hasujanae*. Here *mone* is in the Pluperfect, because it means, he *had made up* his mind.

He was going to first sow that field and then start for Ranchi when he got sick, becomes, *I shall first sow that field and then go to Ranchi*, saying he *had made up his mind*, when he got sick : *En loeonging herlea ente Ranchiteng sena mente moneakade taekena, mendo hasujanae*,—He was forbidden by the owner to cut that tree. Notwithstanding he was about to cut it, when a tiger came and carried him off, becomes..... nevertheless I will cut it, saying he *had determined* ; but then a tiger, etc.—*En daru alom maea mente kisanre manalia. Enreo mataeang mente moneakade taekena. Entedo kula birete urungjanchie idikta*.

XV.—The Intransitive or Definite Present Imperfect.

This performs two distinct functions :—

- (1) It implies that the action in question was going on in the past simultaneously with another past action spoken of or implied in the same sentence—

Ako dapalken imta enta're sitaning taekena,—I was ploughing there just at the time they were fighting.

- (2) It is also used as Imperfect to the Future instead of the above circumlocution—

Senótaning taekena,—I was (at that time) on the point of going, or I was about to go.

XVI.—The Transitive or Indefinite Present Imperfect.

This is limited to Transitive Predicates. It performs the function described under (1) of the Intransitive Present Imperfect. It is also used as Future Imperfect. *Rajad'-ko-ing-taekena* may mean I was just then calling them, or I was just on the point of calling them.

XVII.—Imperfect of the Continuative Present.

Whereas the Imperfects described under XV and XVI exhibit the action in question as merely simultaneous with some other past action,

this Imperfect denotes that the action having begun before some other past act or event, continued uninterruptedly whilst that other act or event took place: *Hoiote aiñá bened' otangjanchi garare uijana; aingdo sadoming sabakái-taekena mente kaing sabdairijana*,—My pugri being blown away by the wind fell into the river; I could not catch it because at that moment I was (busy) holding the horse.

XVIII.—Imperfect of the Simple Past.

The Intransitive form is hardly used except with *sen*. *Senken-ing-taekena*,—I had been going. The Transitive form is generally replaced by the Anterior Past Tense-form with *taeken*.

XIX.—Imperfect of the Incomplete Past.

This is used with Transitive Predicates to show that a past action had been left in a state of incompleteness before some other past act or event.

I asked him whether he had finished cutting those bamboos. He *had been busy cutting*, but he had not finished. Nevertheless, he told me he had finished,—*En mad'em machabakeda menteng kulikta. Mado ma-ken-e-taekena mendo kae chabaakad taekena. Enreo machabaakadaing mentee kajirurakiña*.

XX.—The Imperfect of the Anterior Past.

This Tense is generally used with both Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, both with its own particular function as well as in cases where we would rather expect the Imperfect of the Simple Past—

Inku auri tebare haiko sab'led'-ko-le-taekena,—We had been catching fish before they arrived.

XXI.—The Imperfect of the Static Past.

This is used with both the meanings explained under III with that modification of time which the Auxiliary *taeken* denotes.

Aputee ruarimta uriko adertad'-ko-e taekena,—He had just driven in the cattle for the night (*i.e.*, permanently) when his father arrived, or he had just driven in the cattle (against orders or before the proper time) when his father arrived.

XXII.—Pluperfect or Imperfect corresponding to the Perfect Tense.

This is used both with its own function as well as a substitute for an Imperfect corresponding to the Past Tense in *jan*.

Susunjanae,—He went to dance and is not yet back. The Imperfect is, *susunte senakane-taeken-a*, never *susun-jan-e-taekena*.

PASSIVE VOICE.

This Voice has a double formation. In the *Indeterminate Tense*, the *Future* and the *Definite Present* it is formed by affixing *ó* to the bare root-form. The *Imperative Mood* forms its Passive in the same manner, because this Mood-form is only the bare root *plus* a Personal Pronominal Affix, *v. gr.*, *lel-me!* look thou! *lel-pe!* look you! *lel-ben!* look you two! The Passive Affix *ó* therefore stands between the root and the Pronominal Affix: thus *dal*, to beat; *dal-o'-me!* be beaten; *dal-o'-ben!* be beaten both of you!

In all the other Tenses the Passive is formed by affixing the *Intransitive Tense-suffixes* to Transitive Predicates.

Thus whilst *lel-led-aing* means I first saw it; *lel-len-aing* means I was first seen.

REMARK 1.—In the third Person Singular of the Indeterminate and the Future Tense the check (') is generally transferred from the Passive Affix *ó* to the Copula *a*, *v. gr.*, *aium*, to hear; *aiumó*, to be heard. Nere han gara *aiumó*,—Yonder river is always heard from here. *Sajai*, to punish; *sajaió*, to be punished; *sajaióde*,—he will be punished.

The same rule is followed of course whenever the Pronominal Subjects are suffixed to a word preceding the Predicate, *v. gr.*, *Gapa-ing sajaióde*,—I shall be punished to-morrow; *gapa-m sajaióde*,—thou wilt be punished to-morrow.

REMARK 2.—Monosyllables ending with checked vowels always insert a *g* before the Affix *ó*, *v. gr.*, *dá*, water; *dá-g-ó*, to become liquid or to turn into water; *ré*, to rob; *re-g-ó*, to be robbed. Dissyllabic words containing no consonants and ending with a checked vowel also insert a *g* before the Passive Affix, *v. gr.*, *uiú*, to drop, to let fall; *uiú-g-ó*, to fall.

Dissyllabic words containing a consonant and ending with a checked vowel sometimes insert this *g* and sometimes they do not, *v. gr.*, *toró*, ashes; *toróó* or *toroe-g-ó*, to be reduced to ashes; *lebé*, soft; *lebéó* or *lebe-g-ó*, to become soft; *peré*, to fill; *peréó* or *pere-g-ó*, to be filled up, to become full.

The checks of all final vowels disappear before the Passive *ó* even in those cases in which the check of *ó* is transferred to the Copula *a*.

REMARK 3.—The Affix *ó* changes very frequently, not to say generally, into *á* when preceded by *i*. This is according to the law of harmony of vowels—

Kaji, to say; *Kaji-u-á*, it is said (generally) or it will be said.

The Future Tense, which has no corresponding Imperfect in the Active Voice, has an Imperfect in the Passive Voice—

Daló taeken-ae,—He was on the point of being beaten when such or such an event occurred.

This Imperfect is even substituted for the Definite Present Imperfect.

The Static Future and the Static Past are wanting in the Passive.

The Anterior Future too is wanting. It may be replaced by the construction with *sidate* given under IV (pages 137 and 138).

The Incomplete Past in *ken* being essentially an Active form is wanting.

The Suffix *jan* is used in the Passive to form the Simple Past Tense as well as an Indefinite Past.

The Passive of the *Indeterminate Tense* is frequently used to denote *feasibility* or *possibility*. For the purpose of this function Intransitive Predicates too take the Affix *ó* in the Indeterminate Tense, *v. gr.*, *Ne jó jom-ó-a*,—This fruit *can be eaten* or *is eatable*; *Nere ka nir-ó-a*,—It is not possible to run here; *En kotore, sen-o-á*,—It is possible to walk on that branch; *Totraute ka durum-ó-a*,—It is impossible to sleep on account of the uproar.

I do not believe the Passive Affix *ó* to be a *débris* of a formerly complete root. If, however, it be such a *débris*, it will hardly be possible to form even a reasonable conjecture concerning the original form and meaning of that root until the Kholarian dialects of India can be traced to a wider group with which they have some more striking resemblances than those which have so far been discovered.

If, on the other hand, *ó* be a complete root, then the only explanation presenting itself to me is the following :

As has already been shown, *á* means both *to be* and *to become*. But the idea of *becoming*, besides implying *futurity*, does also imply the idea of *being acted upon*, i.e., the idea of *passivity*; for the mind, as a matter of fact, *does not conceive* incipency or effect without, at least implicitly, referring the effect or that which begins to a *cause* distinct from the effect: hence this *á* (*to become*) may, with as much reason, be used to signify the idea of *being acted upon* or the notion of *passivity* as it is to signify *futurity*. Suppose, now, that *á* be actually used for the purpose of denoting that particular *nuance* implied in the idea of *becoming*, we would, in the Indeterminate Tense, get this *á* twice immediately after the bare root: thus *dal-á-á-ing*; literally, Strike become being I, or more freely a *becoming* struck being I, i.e., *Becoming* or *getting* struck am I. Now in such a case it would appear natural that a vowel change should have been adopted to signify the implied *nuance* of passivity, and that the *á*-form should have been kept for the purpose of signifying futurity and that of link-word.

If this supposition be correct, it allows of the following statement: The Passive Affix *ó* is but an alternative form of *á*, *to become*, which has assumed as its primary meaning that particular *nuance* of the original concept which implies the correlation between cause and effect. Its precise function, therefore, consists in exhibiting the Subject of the proposition as being acted upon by a cause distinct from itself.

Mundari is not the only language which uses the idea of *becoming* as a functional exponent of both futurity and passivity: thus, *v. gr.*, German, when forced to replace worn-out formative elements by complete Auxiliaries, instinctively turned to the Verb *werden*, *to become*, for the same purposes. *Ich werde schlagen*,—I will or shall strike; literally means I *become* to strike. *Ich werde geschlagen*, I am being beaten; literally means I *become* struck. In the Future of the Passive the same auxiliary occurs in both functions: *Ich werde geschlagen werden*, I shall be beaten; literally, I become becoming beaten. English auxiliaries too present a striking instance of that instinctive tendency which uses *nuances* or, if I may say so, *side-ideas* implied in a concept, for special functional or formative purposes. To quote but one: *To will* denotes self-determination; but this implies the *origin* or the *beginning* of a new self-modification. It is therefore generically the same idea as that implied by *to become*. As such, it necessarily implies

futurity. It is no doubt on account of this *implied* futurity that the Verb *to will* has been chosen as an Auxiliary for the *Future Tense*.

REFLEXIVE VOICE.

By *Reflexive Voice* we understand that form of a Transitive Predicate which implies that the action denoted by the Predicate falls back on the agent himself, or that the Subject of the proposition represents both the *agent* and the *terminus* of the action.

It is formed by affixing *n* to the root or predicative element. Roots ending with a consonant insert a euphonic *e*, *o*, *i* or *u* before the *n*. The choice of the vowel is determined by the law of harmony. *Ex.*—*Dal*, to strike; *dal-e-n*, to strike oneself; *Ur*, to skin; *ur-i-n*, to shed one's skin; *Bingko urina*, snakes throw their skin.

The Reflexive *n* is affixed to the root only in the *Indeterminate Tense*, the *Simple Future*, the *Definite Present*, and the *Indefinite Past* in *jan* and in the corresponding Imperfects. In all the other Tenses the Intransitive Tense-suffixes in *n* are used for the Reflexive as well as for the Passive Voice.

The Mundari Reflexive Voice is not limited to the cases in which we would use a Transitive Predicate with a Reflexive Pronoun as Direct Object. This is mainly due to the fact that Mundas may use any and every root with a Transitive function. This obliges them in certain cases to have recourse to the Reflexive Voice where we use ready-made Intransitive Verbs. *V. gr.*—*Dasi*, a servant; *dasin*, to serve (*literally*, to make a servant of oneself). In other cases too, where we have Intransitive Verbs, they have recourse to the Reflexive Voice, *v. gr.*, *to feign*, *to pretend*, is in Mundari rendered by the Reflexive form of *bai*, to make. He pretends to be ill,—*Hasu baintanae*. As will be seen from the two examples just quoted, the Reflexive form is not always purely Reflexive in meaning according to our ideas. We would expect *dasin* to mean *to serve one's self*, *to act as one's own servant in certain cases*. Again, a beginner is liable to translate *hasubain* by *to make one's self really sick*. In other cases the Reflexive form is used where the agent is, according to our way of thinking, the Indirect Object, *v. gr.*, *dul*, to pour; *dulen*, to pour on or over one's self; *uiu'*, to throw; *uiun*, to throw (a cloth) over one's self, *i.e.*, to cover one's whole body with a big cloth which is thrown over the shoulders. A correct and idiomatic

use of the Reflexive form can be learnt only through intercourse with the people.

I am inclined to think that the Reflexive Affix *n* is simply the Demonstrative *ne*, *this* (see Chapter I, page 10, *Note 1*) for the following reason:—

According to the rules regulating the insertion into the Predicate of Direct Objects denoting living beings, we should expect the following forms, *v. gr.*—

Pr. root. D. O. Pr. Tense. C. S.

<i>Dal-<u>ing</u> - tan - a - ing,</i>	I strike me (myself).	<i>Dal-<u>king</u>-tan-a-king.</i>
<i>Dal-<u>me</u> - tan - a - m,</i>	Thou strikest thee (thyself).	<i>Dal-<u>bu</u> -tan-a-bu.</i>
<i>Dal-<u>i</u> - tan - a - e,</i>	He (she) strikes himself.	<i>Dal-<u>le</u> -tan-a-le.</i>
<i>Dal-<u>lang</u> - tan - a - lang,</i>	Thou and I strike thee and me.	<i>Dal-<u>pe</u> -tan-a-pe.</i>
<i>Dal-<u>ling</u> - tan - a - ling,</i>	He and I strike him and me.	<i>Dal-<u>ko</u> -tan-a-ko.</i>
<i>Dal-<u>ben</u> - tan - a - ben,</i>	You two strike yourselves.	

Now it will be remarked that the form *dal-i-tan-a-e*,—he strikes him, is ambiguous, because it does not appear from the form alone whether the Pronoun *i*, which stands here as Inserted Direct Object, denotes the same individual which is denoted by the Subject *e* (the weak form of *i*) or whether it denotes some third person different from the Subject.

The same ambiguity exists in the forms *dal-king-tan-a-king*, *dalko-tan-a-ko*. Again, in the Inclusive Dual *dal-lang-tan-a-lang*,—thou and I strike thee and me, it does not appear from the form whether I strike myself and the included second person strikes himself, or whether we strike each other mutually. A similar ambiguity exists for the Exclusive Dual as well as for the Inclusive and Exclusive Plural of the first Person.

But if, instead of the Direct Objects *i*, *king*, *ko*, *lang*, *ling*, etc., the Definite Demonstrative *ne*, *this*, be inserted as Direct Object, then this Demonstrative could readily be understood as referring to or pointing out the Pronominal Subjects *i*, *king*, *ko*, *lang*, *le*, etc., for the purpose of thus identifying the Direct Object with the Subject.

The meaning of the Demonstrative *n* could then be translated into *that same he*, *those same two*, *those same ones*, etc.—

Dal-en-tan-a-e,—He strikes that same he, *i.e.*, himself.

The Inserted Demonstrative thus interpreted would remove all ambiguity and at the same time set the forms *dal-i-tanae*, *dal-king-tanaking*, *dal-ko-tanako*, etc., free to signify Subjects and Direct Objects distinct from each other. And in fact these forms are in constant use, but the Direct Objects *i*, *king*, *ko* are understood to denote third persons different from those denoted by the Subjects *i*, *king*, *ko* in the same compounds. *Dal-i-tan-ae* means He or she strikes some other third person.

If the explanation here given as to the manner in which the ambiguity mentioned has been removed be admissible, it is easily understood how, for the sake of uniformity, the Demonstrative *n* should have come to be inserted as Direct Object also in the few cases in which there would be no ambiguity if the Personal Pronoun were inserted as Direct Object. This, then, would allow the following statement. The Definite Demonstrative *n* is inserted as Direct Object into Transitive Predicates whenever it is required to point out that the agent and the sufferer of an action are identical. *This insertion yields the Reflexive Voice.*

RECIPROCAL VOICE.

By the *Reciprocal Voice* we understand that form of a Transitive Predicate which implies that the action denoted by that Predicate is reciprocal between two individuals or two sets of individuals. In other words, the Reciprocal Voice implies that the individuals denoted by the Subject of the Proposition reciprocate the same action on each other.

The Reciprocal Voice is formed by inserting the consonant *p* after the first vowel of a Transitive root, then repeating that vowel and adding to it the remaining part of the root—

om, to give; *o-p-om*, to give to each other; *nel*, to see; *ne-p-el*, to see each other.
dal, to strike; *da-p-al*, to strike each other; *re*, to rob; *re-p-e*, to rob each other.
kaji, to say; *ka-p-aji*, to converse with each other; *erang*, to scold; *e-p-erang*, to quarrel.
ma, to cut; *ma p-a*, to fight with axes, swords or knives.

The Reciprocal Voice has of course only the Dual and the Plural Numbers.

NOTE.—The Pronoun *pe* or *ape* if used transitively means to call some people you or to 'you' some one's, i.e., to put some people into the relation of *second persons* with regard to the speaker.

PE May it not be that *pe* you, is, with a transitive function inserted into the root of Predicates for the purpose of signifying that the agents (i.e., the Dual or Plural Subjects to such Predicates) put themselves with regard to each other into the relation of Second Persons, not indeed as speakers and parties addressed, but as agents and reagents, as reciprocating on each other the action denoted by the Predicates into which *pe* is inserted in the shape of the consonant *p*

The idiomatic use of the Reciprocal Voice presents even greater difficulties than that of the Reflexive Voice.

Functionally it may be divided into the Direct Reciprocal, and the Indirect Reciprocal.

The Direct Reciprocal implies that the agents and reagents denoted by the Subject are at the same time the *Direct* Objects of the action signified by the Predicate, *v.g.*, these two always greet each other,—*Niking jo-p-oaraking*.

The Indirect Reciprocal implies that the *Direct* Object of the Predicate is some living being or inanimate object *distinct* from the persons or animals denoted by the Subject, *i.e.*, generally something owned by them. The persons or animals denoted by the Subject are *Indirect* Objects of the action signified by the Predicate, *v. gr.*, They show their bows and arrows to each other. In the war dance they strike (at) each other's swords. Hence sentences in which the Predicate is an *Indirect Reciprocal* contain a Noun or Pronoun denoting the Direct Object, whereas those in which the Predicate is a *Direct Reciprocal* do not contain such a Noun or Pronoun, *v. gr.*, *Direct Reciprocal*—*Ta-p-amtanaking*,—the two hit each other. *Indirect Reciprocal*—*Taurauri-king ta-p-amtana*,—They strike (at) each other's swords.

Inasmuch as neither of the agents and reagents is the terminus or sufferer of the action, the *Indirect Reciprocal* participates of the nature of the *Active Voice*: hence it is quite natural that in the Past Tenses the Transitive Tense-affixes ending in *d* must be used and not the Intransitive or Passive Affixes ending, in *n*, *viz.*, *ked* for the Simple Past, *led* for the Anterior Past, *tal* for the Static Past, and *akad* for the Perfect and the Continuative Present.

From the Active nature of the Indirect Reciprocal it also follows that Pronominal Objects should be inserted into this Reciprocal form whenever the Direct Object denotes living beings, *v. gr.*—

They show their hawks to each other,—*Lampiking u-p-udub-jad' king-a-king*.

In a word, the Indirect Reciprocal is in every respect treated like a Simple Transitive Predicate of the *Active Voice* regarding Mood and Tense-suffixes.

The Direct Reciprocal, on the contrary, is treated as a Transitive Predicate of the *Passive Voice*, because in this form the Subjects of the proposition are at the same time the sufferers or termini of the action denoted by the Predicate. However, the Passive Affix *o* is not used

because the Infix *p* is supposed to perform at the same time the function of that Passive Affix. Hence—

(1) In the Anterior Future the Tense-suffix *kó* must be used instead of *le*, *v. gr.*, *tipi-kó-alang*,—Let us first shake hands ; never *tipi-le-alang*.

(2) The Indefinite Present in *jad* is always replaced by the Definite Present in *tan* : *eperang-tan-akó*,—They scold each other ; never *eperang-jad-ako*.

(3) The Past Tenses take the Tense-suffixes ending in *n*, *viz.*, *ken*, *len*, *jan*, and *akan*.

The very same word may be used as Direct and as Indirect Reciprocal—

Ti, hand ; *tipi*, to take each other's hand, *i.e.*, to shake hands ; and *tipi*, to take up or to handle each other's property, *v. gr.*, a bow.

Nel, to see ; *nepel*, to see each other, to look at each other ; and *nepel*, to look at each other's property, or to show (*i.e.*, let see) each other's property to one another.

Udub', to show and to denounce ; *upudub'*, to denounce each other ; and *upudub*, to show each other's property one to another.

The words *to steal*, *to rob*, *to give*, *to help*, and *their synonyms* are treated as Direct Reciprocals, even when in English a distinct Direct or Indirect Object is expressed in the sentence, *v. gr.*, They robbed each other of their rice.—*Babako repé-ken-a*. They helped each other with money,—*Takako depenga-ken-a*,—They gave presents to each other,—*Enemko opom-ken-a*.

The following table shows the Tense-suffixes of the Direct and the Indirect Reciprocals respectively :—

<i>Direct Reciprocal.</i>	<i>Indirect Reciprocal.</i>
<i>Indeter. T.</i> — <i>Nepel-ako</i> ,—They habitually see each other.	<i>Asar-ko nepel-e-a</i> ,—They are in the habit of showing their bows and arrows to each other.
<i>Simple Fut.</i> — <i>Nepel-ako</i> ,—They will see each other.	<i>Asar-ko nepel-e-a</i> ,—They will show their bows and arrows to each other.
<i>Anter. Fut.</i> — <i>Nepel-kó-ako</i> ,—They will first see each other.	<i>Asar-ko nepel-le-a</i> ,—They will first show their bows and arrows to each other.

The idiomatic use of the Reciprocal Voice presents even greater difficulties than that of the Reflexive Voice.

Functionally it may be divided into the Direct Reciprocal, and the Indirect Reciprocal.

The Direct Reciprocal implies that the agents and reagents denoted by the Subject are at the same time the *Direct* Objects of the action signified by the Predicate, *v.g.*, these two always greet each other,—*Niking jo-p-oaraking*.

The Indirect Reciprocal implies that the *Direct* Object of the Predicate is some living being or inanimate object *distinct* from the persons or animals denoted by the Subject, *i.e.*, generally something owned by them. The persons or animals denoted by the Subject are *Indirect* Objects of the action signified by the Predicate, *v. gr.*, They show their bows and arrows to each other. In the war dance they strike (at) each other's swords. Hence sentences in which the Predicate is an *Indirect Reciprocal* contain a Noun or Pronoun denoting the Direct Object, whereas those in which the Predicate is a *Direct Reciprocal* do not contain such a Noun or Pronoun, *v. gr.*, *Direct Reciprocal*—*Ta-p-amtanaking*,—the two hit each other. *Indirect Reciprocal*—*Tarauri-king ta-p-amtana*,—They strike (at) each other's swords.

Inasmuch as neither of the agents and reagents is the terminus or sufferer of the action, the *Indirect Reciprocal* participates of the nature of the *Active Voice*: hence it is quite natural that in the Past Tenses the Transitive Tense-affixes ending in *d* must be used and not the Intransitive or Passive Affixes ending, in *n*, *viz.*, *ked* for the Simple Past, *led* for the Anterior Past, *tal* for the Static Past, and *akad* for the Perfect and the Continuative Present.

From the Active nature of the Indirect Reciprocal it also follows that Pronominal Objects should be inserted into this Reciprocal form whenever the Direct Object denotes living beings, *v. gr.*—

They show their hawks to each other,—*Lampiking u-p-udub-jad' king-a-king*.

In a word, the Indirect Reciprocal is in every respect treated like a Simple Transitive Predicate of the *Active Voice* regarding Mood and Tense-suffixes.

The Direct Reciprocal, on the contrary, is treated as a Transitive Predicate of the *Passive Voice*, because in this form the Subjects of the proposition are at the same time the sufferers or termini of the action denoted by the Predicate. However, the Passive Affix *o* is not used

because the Infix *p* is supposed to perform at the same time the function of that Passive Affix. Hence—

(1) In the Anterior Future the Tense-suffix *kó* must be used instead of *le*, *v. gr.*, *tipi-kó-alang*,—Let us first shake hands ; never *tipi-le-alang*.

(2) The Indefinite Present in *jad* is always replaced by the Definite Present in *tan* : *eperang-tan-akó*,—They scold each other ; never *eperang-jad-ako*.

(3) The Past Tenses take the Tense-suffixes ending in *n*, *viz.*, *ken*, *len*, *jan*, and *akan*.

The very same word may be used as Direct and as Indirect Reciprocal—

Ti, hand ; *tipi*, to take each other's hand, *i.e.*, to shake hands ; and *tipi*, to take up or to handle each other's property, *v. gr.*, a bow.

Nel, to see ; *nepel*, to see each other, to look at each other ; and *nepel*, to look at each other's property, or to show (*i.e.*, let see) each other's property to one another.

Udub', to show and to denounce ; *upudub'*, to denounce each other ; and *upudub*, to show each other's property one to another.

The words *to steal*, *to rob*, *to give*, *to help*, and *their synonyms* are treated as Direct Reciprocals, even when in English a distinct Direct or Indirect Object is expressed in the sentence, *v. gr.*, They robbed each other of their rice.—*Babako repé-ken-a*. They helped each other with money,—*Takako depenga-ken-a*,—They gave presents to each other,—*Enemko opom-ken-a*.

The following table shows the Tense-suffixes of the Direct and the Indirect Reciprocals respectively :—

<i>Direct Reciprocal.</i>	<i>Indirect Reciprocal.</i>
<i>Indeter. T.</i> — <i>Nepel-ako</i> ,—They habitually see each other.	<i>Asar-ko nepel-e-a</i> ,—They are in the habit of showing their bows and arrows to each other.
<i>Simple Fut.</i> — <i>Nepel-ako</i> ,—They will see each other.	<i>Asar-ko nepel-e-a</i> ,—They will show their bows and arrows to each other.
<i>Anter. Fut.</i> — <i>Nepel-kó-ako</i> ,—They will first see each other.	<i>Asar-ko nepel-le-a</i> ,—They will first show their bows and arrows to each other.

Direct Reciprocal—concl.

Defin. Pres.—*Nepel-tan-ako*,—They are seeing each other.

Indef. Pres.—Not used.

Contin. Present.—*Nepel-akan-a-ko*,—They keep looking at each other.

Simple Past.—*Nepel-ken-ako*,—They saw each other.

Anter. Past.—*Nepel-len-ako*,—They first saw each other.

Perfect.—*Nepel-akan-ako*,—They have seen each other.

Indef. Past.—Not used.

Intent. Past.—*Nepel-jan-ako*,—They are gone to see each other.

Indirect Reciprocal—concl.

Asarko nepel-tan-a,—They are now looking at each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-jad-a,—They look at each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-akad-a,—They keep looking at each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-ked-a,—They looked at each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-led-a,—They first saw each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-akad-a,—They have looked at each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-jan-a,—They have seen each other's bows and arrows.

Asarko nepel-jan-a,—They are gone to look at each other's bows and arrows.

When two words concur to form a Compound Predicate, the Reciprocal *p* is generally infixed in both words.

Ir, to reap; *ré*, to rob: hence *ir-ré* means to rob some one by cutting his harvest: hence *i-p-ir-re-p-étanaking*,—The two are robbing each other by cutting each other's harvest.

Nir, to run, *darom*, against or towards: hence *nir-darom*, to run against or to run towards: hence *ni-p-ir-da p-aromkenaking*,—They ran or rushed against each other.

Har, to drive, to run after; *nir*, to run: hence *Ha-p-arni-p-ir*, to play a game in which one must try to catch or overtake another who runs.

The insertion of the *p* may, however, be confined to the principal word, *v. gr.*, *nir-da-p-arom*.

The following table shows all the Tense-suffixes as they occur through the four Voices.
Those marked * have no Imperfects. The Indirect Reciprocal forms contain *ko* as Direct Object.

	ACTIVE VOICE.										PASSIVE VOICE.				REFLEXIVE VOICE.				RECIPROCAL VOICE.																			
	Intransitive.					Transitive.																																
	R.	T.	C.	S.		R.	T.	O.	C.	S.	R.	V.	T.	C.	S.	R.	V.	T.	C.	S.	R.	V.	R.	T.	O.	C.	S.											
I.—Indeterm. Tense	sen-	...	a-	e	...	{	lel-	...	ko-	a-	e	(l. b.)	...	}	lel-	o-	...	a-	e	...	lel-	en-	...	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	a-	king	...	(Direct.)
								{	lel-	...	e-	a-	e	(i. o.)	...	}							lel-	en-	...	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	...	ko-	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)
II.—Simple Future	sen-	...	a-	e	...	{	lel-	...	ko-	a-	e	(l. b.)	...	}	lel-	ó-	...	a-	e	...	lel-	en-	...	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	...	ko-	a-	king	...	(Direct.)
								{	lel-	...	e-	a-	e	(i. o.)	...	}								en-	...	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	...	e-	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)
III.—Static Future	Wanting	tol-	ta-	ko-	a-	e	Wanting	Wanting	{	Wanting	ko-	a-	king	...	(Direct.)
																																					(Indirect.)	
IV.—Anterior Future	{	sen-	le-	a-	ing	...	}	lel-	le-	ko-	a-	e	...	Wanting	{	lel-	...	kó-	a-	e	...	}	{	le-	p-	el-	kó-	...	a-	king	...	(Direct.)		
			{	sen-	kó-	a-	ing	...	}									{	lel-	...	len-	a-	e	...	}	{	le-	p-	el-	le-	ko-	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)			
V.—Present	sen-	tan-	a-	e	...	{	lel-	jad-	ko-	a-	e	(l. b.)	...	}	lel-	ó-	tan-	a-	e	...	lel-	en-	tan-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	tan-	...	a-	king	...	(Direct.)
								{	lel-	jad-	...	a-	e	(i. o.)	...	}								en-	tan-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	jad-	ko-	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)
VI.—Definite Present	Wanting	{	lel-	(O. ko- T.) tan- a- e	...	}	Wanting	Wanting	Wanting	{	Wanting	ko-	a-	king	...	(Direct.)	
								{	lel-	...	tan-	a-	e	...	}														{	le-	p-	el-	(O. ko- T.) tan-	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)	
VII.—Continuative Present	sen-	akad'ge-	a-	e	...	{	lel-	akad'- koge-	a-	e	(l. b.)	...	}	lel-	ó-	tunge-	a-	e	...	lel-	en-	tunge-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	(T. O.) akad'ge-	...	a-	king	...	(Direct.)	
								{	lel-	akad'ge	...	a-	e	(i. o.)	...	}													{	le-	p-	el-	akad'- koge-	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)	
VIII.—Simple Past	sen-	ken-	a-	e	...	{	lel-	ked'- ko-	a-	e	(l. b.)	...	}	lel-	...	len-	a-	e	...	lel-	...	ken-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	len-	...	a-	king	...	(Direct.)	
								{	lel-	ked	...	a-	e	(i. o.)	...	}	lel-	...	jan-	a-	e	...	lel-	...	jan-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	jan-	...	a-	king	...	(Indirect.)
IX.—Incomplete Past					tol-	ken-	...	a-	e,	—He was busy tying, but has not finished.	Wanting	Wanting	Wanting	Wanting.											
X.—Static Past	Wanting	tol-	tad'-	ko-	a-	e	...	Wanting	Wanting	Wanting	{	Wanting	ko-	a-	king	...	(Direct.)		
																																					(Indirect.)	
XI.—Anterior Past	sen-	len-	a-	e	...	lel-	led'-	ko-	a-	e	...	lel-	...	len-	a-	e	...	lel-	...	len-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	len-	...	a-	king	...	(Direct.)			
																																					(Indirect.)	
XII.—Indefinite or Intentional Past	...		inung-jan-	a-	e,	—he went to play.		lel-	jan-	...	a-	e,	—he went to see.	lel-ó-	(Adv. Suff. T.) ti- jan a	...	lel-	en-	ti-	jan-	a	...	(Adv. S. T. C.)				{	le-	p-	el-	jan-	...	a-	king,	—	(Direct.)		
																																					(Indirect.)	
XIII.—Perfect	sen-	akan-	a-	e	...	lel-	akad'-	ko-	a-	e	...	lel-	...	akan-	a-	e	...	lel-	...	akan-	a-	e	...	{	le-	p-	el-	akan-	...	a-	king	...	(Direct.)			
																																					(Indirect.)	

Origin and meaning of the Tense-suffixes.


Tan seems to be a compound of the Static Suffix *ta* and the Demonstrative *ne*. The Static *ta* is identical with the root of the Postposition *tá* (see pages 34 and 35). This *ta* presupposes concrete existence which in Mundari is signified by *mená*. To judge from its meaning as a Postposition and as Static Suffix, *ta* would seem to primarily and directly denote *continuance, duration, permanency*, just as *eté*, signifies *beginning* and *chaba, completion*. According to the *genius* of the language it may be used with a Transitive or Intransitive function, and then mean either *to last, to continue* (Intransitive) or *to render permanent* (Transitive) just as *eté* may mean *to commence, to begin*, and as *chaba* may mean *to finish* or *to complete* (Transitive and Intransitive).

This, like other roots, may be added to a primary root for the purpose of modifying its original meaning, thus—

Été, to begin; *tol-été*, to begin to tie; *chaba*, to finish; *tol-chaba*, to complete the act of tying; *ta*, to render permanent; *tol-ta*, to render permanent the state brought about by the act of tying (first of the meanings explained above on page 132) or to persist in the intention of tying (second meaning). The duration or continuance denoted by *ta* is in no way specified. It is an indefinite one: hence the peculiar meaning of the Static forms. If now it be desired to specify this duration so as to refer or limit it to the present time only, the Demonstrative *ne* would naturally be used for that purpose; for specification and limitation is the primary function of this Demonstrative: hence the Compound Suffix *ta-n* would directly denote a duration limited to the present time. It would in fact mean *to be busy with something now*, so that *tol-tan-aing* would literally denote a present tying and mean *I am busy tying now*. This is precisely the meaning of the Definite Present.

The fact that *ta* in the Static forms points *not to the action itself* as lasting, but to its effects, whereas *tan* directly denotes the present duration *of the action itself*, presents no difficulty. For indefinite duration, such as is signified by *ta*, cannot as a rule be predicated of actions themselves. These can last indefinitely only in their effects.

If *ta* really mean *to continue, to last*, as is here supposed, then its Reflexive form would be *ta-en* and mean to make or cause oneself to continue indefinitely, *i.e., to remain*; but it so happens that the Mundari equivalent of the Verb *to remain* is precisely the word *taen* or *tain*. This no doubt supports the views just exposed concerning the meaning



of the Static *ta* and the composition of *tan*. The generic Imperfect Suffix *taeken* is but a contraction of the Simple Past of *taen*, viz., *taenken*. This form is sometimes used instead of the contracted form.

Ta and *ka* seem to be but two different forms of the same original root. At any rate they are perfect equivalents of each other as appears from the following facts. The Mundari and Sonthali dialects differ but slightly from each other. Now (1) the Sonthals use *ka* where the Mundas use *ta* to denote permanency of the effects of an action. (2) The Sonthals use *kan*, as Copula in Substantive propositions and as Definite or Intransitive Present Tense-suffix where the Mundas use *tan*. (3) In both dialects *akan* (*akad*) are used as Perfect and as Continuative Present Suffixes: hence whereas the Sonthals use *ka*, *kan*, *akan* for both the Present and the Perfect, the Mundas have reserved *ta* and *tan* for the Present.

Ken is plainly but a weak form of *kan*. In both dialects *ken* is used as a Simple Past Suffix. This is another striking instance of vowel-change being used for obtaining a change of meaning.

Akan.—The explanation of this as a Continuative Present and Perfect Tense-suffix presents some difficulty. I am inclined to think that the initial *a* of *akan* is not really a part of the Tense-suffix as such; in other words, that this *a* does not directly belong as a specification to the Suffix *kan*, but rather to the root of the Predicate. If so, *kan* alone would be the Tense-suffix, and this Suffix is added, not to the bare root, but to the root *plus a*.

Strictly speaking, the *Perfect Tense* falls under the category of Present Tenses, inasmuch as it directly denotes a *present state* brought about by a completed or accomplished action. So far, then, the Present Tense-suffix *kan* remains within its proper function in the Perfect Tense; but by itself alone it does in no way express that other connotation of this Tense, which consists in representing the action as an accomplished fact. This, I believe, is done by *a* being suffixed as a specification to the root. A root or word conceived then and there as an Adjective is transformed into a Noun by the Affix *a*, v.gr., *pundi*, white; *pundiā*, something white. Similarly, *a* transforms into Nouns certain roots conceived then

and there *transitively* or *intransitively*: *Jom*, to eat; *jomed*, that which can be eaten or that which is ready to be eaten, *i.e.*, eatables.

Now, may it not be supposed that *a* is similarly suffixed to roots conceived first transitively or intransitively for the purpose of changing them into Nouns denoting the action in question substantively so as to represent them as complete? Thus *hijû*, to come; *hijua*, the coming or the arrival; *sen*, to go; *sena*, the going or the having gone, *i.e.*, the absence. The compound thus obtained can be made to resume its Transitive or Intransitive function by being referred to a Subject by means of the Copula *a*.

If to this new Predicate the Present Tense-suffix *kan* be suffixed, the Copula *a* refers the completed action to a subject as a *present* state—*Hijû-tan-ae* literally means coming-now-is-he; *Hijua-kan-a-e* means Having-come-now-is-he.

If this be so, we should say that in the Mundari Perfect the action itself is denoted by the bare root of the Predicate, *v. gr.*, *hijû*; the state brought about by the action is denoted by *a*, inasmuch as it transforms the root into a Noun denoting a state *hijû-a*; the present duration of that state is denoted by the Suffix *kan*.

Ked and *a-kad*.—Just as the consonant *n* in *ken* represents a distinct Demonstrative root, so does the *d* of *ked* and *a-kad* represent a distinct original root. But here the question arises—Is this root the same as the one represented by *n*, or is it both with regard to its *original meaning and form* a different root? That Mundari should have two differently ending Suffixes for Transitive and Intransitive Predicates is in itself every remarkable. Transitivity and Intransitivity are not so much objective qualities of actions as subjective modes of conceiving actions. Even such actions as pre-suppose a terminus distinct from the agent may be conceived *exclusively in their relation to the agent, i.e.*, as Intransitive. Now these subjective modes of conceiving actions are not in other languages expressed by special distinct formative elements *ad hoc*. It would therefore be very extraordinary if the Mundas had recourse to a special root for the purpose of directly denoting transitivity, if, in a word, the consonant *d* represented an original root which would both in *form* and *meaning* differ from *n*. The consonant *d* must, I think, be considered as a mere alternative for the consonant *n*, and the substitution of *d* for *n* has been caused solely by phonetic exigencies. If the Mundas did not

insert Pronominal Objects after these Suffixes, *ken* and *a-kan* would no doubt be used with Transitive as well as with Intransitive Predicates. The forms *lel-ken-iñ-ae*, *lel-ken-me-ae*, *lel-ken-i-ae*, *lel-ken-lang-ae* are rather heavy. Hence the substitution of the dental *d* for the dental *n* has been made for the purpose of obtaining the lighter forms *lel-ked-iñ-ae*, *lel-ked'-me-ae*, etc. The check on *d*, which is used before consonants, renders this consonant still more similar to the *n* it replaces.

Len, *led*, and *tad* are evidently only contractions of *le-ken*, *le-ked*, and *ta-ked*.

Ló, as stated in the Chapter on Postpositions, denotes *simultaneity* in time and *concomitancy* in space.

Le, as appears from the function it performs in the Anterior Future and the Anterior Past, denotes *priority*, i.e., a comparative or relative past. Both *ló* and *le* therefore denote relations of time. May not, then, *ló* and *le* be but different modulations of one and the same root, the difference of meaning being brought about by the change in the root-vowel, just as an analogous change of meaning has been caused by the vowel change in *kan* and *ken*?

Lá denotes *excess* in *extent*, in *duration*, and in *intensity*. It is used as a Pronoun, as an Adverb, and as a Transitive and Intransitive predicate. *Enate láge*, *more than that*, *further than that*; *gel sirmaete láge*, *longer than ten years ago*, or *longer than for ten years to come*; *lá-kedae*, *he exceeded the distance*, *he exceeded the time*. If *lá*, *ló* and *le* be in reality but different modulations of the same root, they constitute an interesting example of changes in meaning being caused by mere vowel changes.

Yan is the Transitive equivalent of the Suffix *jan*.

The variations *yan*, *yad*, and *nad* are used in certain districts instead of *jan* and *jad*.

I am unable to offer even a plausible conjecture concerning the real nature and original meaning of this Suffix.

Le and *ta*, as stated above, cannot be called *Tense-suffixes* in the strict sense of the word. We may therefore say that, with the exception of *jan* and *jad*, all the Mundari Tense-suffixes are but variations of the roots *ta* and *ne*.

Imperative Mood.

This Mood, like the Indicative, has no special Affix.

The Personal Pronouns of the Second Person Singular, Dual or Plural are added to the root or to the root modified by a Tense-suffix or by a Voice-suffix—

Sen-me! go (thou); *nir-ben*, run (you two); *hijú-pe!* come (you).

It occurs in all the four Voices—*Abung-en-me!* Wash thyself!
Dal-ó-pe! Be beaten (you)! *Du-p-ular-pe!* Love each other!

Direct and Indirect Pronominal Objects are inserted immediately before the Pronominal Suffix.—*Lel-ing-me!* Look at me! *Rá-i-ben!* You two call him! *Om-ako-pe*, Give it to them!

It is used in the following Tenses:—

1st.—*The Indeterminate and the Simple Future*—Whenever the Direct Object of a Transitive Predicate is an inanimate being, the vowel *e* is inserted before the Pronominal Suffix—

Lel-e-me! Look at it. *Do-e-ben!* Put it down (you two)! *Hur-ang-e-pe!* Throw it away (you)!

2nd.—*The Static Future*—*Tol-ta-i-me!* Tie him down! *Do-ta-ben!* Put it down and leave it there (you two), or Put it down all the same or nevertheless!

The vowel *e* of *me* is generally dropped when this Suffix is immediately preceded by the Static Affix *ta* or by the Pronominal Objects *ko* or *ako*. *Do-ta-m!* *ra-ko-m!* Call them! *Ader-ta-ko-m!* Drive them in and shut them up! or, drive them in notwithstanding!

3rd.—*The Intransitive Anterior Future in kó and the Anterior Future in le*. Remark that *me* does not drop its *e* after *kó* and *le*—*Hijú-kó-me!* First come here (thou)! *Sen-le-me!* First go (to such or such a place)! *Rá-le-ko-m!* First call them (thou)!

N. B.—Whenever *kó* is suffixed to words which form their Anterior Future in *le*, the Suffix *kó* assumes the meaning of a polite invitation. *Sen-kó-me!* Go, please! *Ol-kó-me!* Do write, please! *Dub-kó-pe!* Do sit down, please!

Even with those words which form their Anterior Future exclusively in *kó*, that Suffix frequently implies a polite invitation: hence circumstances must decide whether, for instance, *Hijú-kó-me!* means *first come here!* or *do come, please!*

The Suffix *len* is sometimes used in the Imperative and the Precative Mood for the purpose of expressing defiance. This form is restricted to Intransitive Predicates. *Hijú-len-me!* Come if thou dare! Come and thou wilt see something! *Sen-len-me!* Go if thou dare!

Mar enka *kahani-len-kae* ale menálere !—All right let him dare to lie like that in our presence (when we are present).

4th.—*The Continuative Present.*—In the Active forms the *d* of *akad* is always dropped—*Goaka-m* ! Keep carrying it ; *Sabaka-ko-m* ! Continue holding them ! *Otongaká-i-ben* ! Keep following him (you two) ; *Senaka-m* ! Keep on walking ! never stop walking !

The Affix *akan* is used with two distinct functions in the Imperative :—

1st.—To distinguish the strictly *Intransitive* from the *Transitive* functions in those words which have both functions :—

Birid!, to raise—Imperative, *birid-aka-m* ! *biriden*, to rise—Imperative, *birid-akan-me* !

Tingu, to put on end—Imperative, *tingu-aka-m* ! *tingun*, to stand—Imperative, *tingu-akan-me* !

Hape, to silence—Imperative, *hape-aka-m* ! v. gr., keep that drum silent, let that drum no longer be heard ! en dumang *hape-aka-m* ; *hapen*, to be silent—Imperative *hape-akan-me* !

2nd.—With purely *Intransitive* Predicates, such as *sen*, *hijú*, *nir*, etc., *akan* sometimes implies a threat and sometimes it conveys the idea of keeping out of reach so as to avoid a threat.

Sen-aka-m ! Keep on walking ! but *Sen-akan-me* ! Continue walking or going to such and such a place *if thou dare* ! or Go and remain away (because it is no longer safe here for thee) ! *Hijú-aka-m* ! Keep or continue coming !, but *Hijú-akan-me* ! Continue coming *if thou dare* ! or Come away and remain away (because it is no longer safe for thee over there) !

The very peculiar meaning of these forms is of a *Reflexive nature* for it is equivalent to the phrases *to expose one's self to a danger* by going, coming, etc., or *to save one's self from a danger* by going, coming, etc.

The Imperatives in *akan*, which have been mentioned under (1st), are all corresponding to Reflexive forms : hence I incline to think that the Continuative Present Imperative in *akan* is in all cases a Reflexive-Voice form, and that the final *n* is not belonging to the Tense-suffix, but that it is the formative element of the Reflexive Voice.

If this be so, it justifies the following statement :—

All Continuative Presents are formed by the Suffix *akad*. In the Imperative the final *d* is always dropped. In the Reflexive Voice

the Voice-affix *n* stands between the Tense-suffix *aka* and the final Pronoun: hence the Imperatives quoted above must be analyzed as follows:—

Root, Tense, Voice, Pron.	Root, Tense, Voice, Pron.	Root, Tense, Voice, Pron.
<i>birid</i> - <i>aka</i> - <i>n</i> - <i>me</i> !	<i>tingu</i> - <i>aka</i> - <i>n</i> - <i>me</i> !	<i>hape</i> - <i>aka</i> - <i>n</i> - <i>me</i> !
<i>sen</i> - <i>aka</i> - <i>n</i> - <i>me</i> !	<i>hijú</i> - <i>aka</i> - <i>n</i> - <i>me</i> !	<i>nir</i> - <i>aka</i> - <i>n</i> - <i>me</i> !

The same explanation applies to the form *Hijúlenme*! Come if thou dare! *i.e.*, expose thyself to danger by coming! hence the analysis *hijú-le-n-me*.

Prohibitions are expressed by placing the prohibitive and deprecative particle *alo*! don't! before the bare root *plus* the Copula. In this construction the Personal Pronouns are suffixed to *alo*! *alo-m hijú-a*! Do not come (thou)! *Alo-ben hijú-a*! Don't come (you to)! *Alo-pe rá-ko-a*! Do not you call them! *Alo-m dal-iñ-a*! Don't strike me! *Alo-ben om-ai-a*! Don't (you two) give it to him!

Precative, Concessive or Optative Mood.

This Mood-form implies that the speaker expresses a *desire* or that he asks or grants a *permission*, a *concession* or a *favour*.

It occurs through the four Voices in the Indeterminate Tense—the Simple, the Anterior, and the Static Future and in the Continuative Present.

The formative element of this Mood is the consonant *k*.

In the Indeterminate Tense and the Simple Future *k* stands immediately before the Copula *a*—

Sen-k-a-ing,—May I go, or let me go; *Chuti-ó-k-a-ing*,—Let me be released, or let me be dismissed. *Dasi-n-k-a-ing*? May I engage myself as a servant? *Depenga-k-a-lang*! Let us help each other (thou and I)!

Direct and Indirect Objects precede the Mood-suffix *k*—
Lel-ko-k-a-ing! Let me see them! *Om-aing-k-a-e*! Let him give it to me!

The vowel *e* is inserted whenever the Direct Object is an inanimate being.

Rim-e-k-a-e! Let him lift it up. *Aium-e-k-a-e!* He may hear it. But *aium-k-a-e!* means let him listen! i.e., let him pay attention!

In the other Tenses the Tense-suffixes are affixed immediately to the root. Direct and Indirect Objects denoting living beings stand between the Tense-suffix and the Mood-suffix *k*.

Objects denoting inanimate beings are not inserted—

Lel-le-k-a-ing? May I first see it? *Tol-ta-ko-k-a-ing!* let me tie them (and leave them tied), or let me tie them notwithstanding.

The Static Future calls for no further explanations.

In the Anterior Future attention must be paid to the following points:—

1st.—*Kó* is used both as Anterior Tense-suffix and as a polite form with most Intransitive Predicates: hence *Sen-kó-k-a-ing* may mean (a) Let me first go, or (b) May I first go, please?

2nd.—In the case of Transitive Predicates *le* is exclusively used as Tense-suffix. In this Mood as well as in the Indicative the *e* of *le* is dropped whenever *ing* or *i* is inserted as Direct or Indirect Objects. *Om-l-ing-k-a-e!* for *om-le-ing k-a-e!* Let him first give it to me! *Rá-l-i-k-a-ing* for *rá-le-i-k-a-ing!* Let me first call him!

The remarks made in the Chapter on the Imperative apply throughout to the Precative or Concessive. Hence (a) in the case of purely Intransitive words, the following difference in meaning exists:—

Sen-aka-k-a-e! Let him continue walking without interruption!

Sen-aka-n-k-a-e! Let him continue going to such a place if he dare, or, Let him go to such a place and remain there to save himself!

(b) In words capable of both functions, *aka* stands for the Transitive and *aka-n* for the Intransitive, i.e., the Reflexive function—

Dumange hape-aka-k-a-e! Let him silence that drum for good and all!

Rutanko hape-aka-ko-k-ae,—Let him keep the drummers silent.

Hape-aka-n-k-a-e! Let him remain silent!

The Suffix *len* is added to Intransitive Predicates for the purpose of implying a threat—

Hijū-le-n-ka-e! Let him come if he dare!

The Suffix *kó* in connection with Transitive Predicates is used exclusively to express a desire or an invitation in a polite manner.

Refusals, prohibitions and requests for exemption are expressed in two ways, in each of which the Negative Particle *ka* is replaced by the Prohibitive *alo*—

1st.—*Alo* with the Pronominal Subject precedes the Simple Future of the Concessive Mood—

Alo-ing kami-k-a,—Let me not be obliged to work. *Alo-e sajai-ó-k-a*,—Let him not be punished.

However, this construction is rather exceptional.

2nd.—Generally the Mood-suffix *k* is detached from the Predicate and suffixed to *alo*. In the Second Person Singular as well as throughout the Dual and Plural a euphonic vowel is necessary to prevent the immediate contact of *k* and the consonants *m*, *l*, *b*, *p*, and *k*: hence in this construction the Emphatic Pronouns *aing*, *am*, *ae*, *alang*, etc., replace the Simple Pronouns—

Alo-k-aing sena,—Let me not be obliged to go.

Alo-k-am sena! Do not go! or Let thee not be obliged to go.

Alo-k-ae sena! Let him not go! or Let him not be obliged to go!

Alo-k-alang sena! Let thee and me not be obliged to go! or Let us not go!

Alo-k-aling sajai-ó-a,—Let him and me not be punished.

Alo-k-aking rá-iñ-a,—Let them (the two) not call me.

Alo-k-abu ep-er-anga,—Let you and me not quarrel.

Alo-k-ale dasi-n-a,—Let me and them not be obliged to engage as servants.

Alo-k-ape nira mente,—Lest you run way, in order that you may not run away.

Alo-k-ako hijua,—Let them not come.

Of the above forms, the Third Person Singular, Dual and Plural are generally used as Imperatives, *i.e.*, for the purpose of conveying prohibitions or refusals.

The First and Second Persons Singular, Dual and Plural occur chiefly in negative Final clauses. In this function they are followed

by *mente*. *Alo-k-ae sena mente nere kami rikajad' mea*,—He makes thee work here lest thou shouldst go, or, to prevent thee from going there, etc. *Ole-ng hating-ape-a alo-k-ape eperanga mente*,—I shall divide the land between you lest you quarrel, or to prevent you from quarrelling.

Attention must be paid to the requisite change of Person in translating these Final clauses from English into Mundari. In English the Subjunctive of the Final clause is in reality equivalent to the indirect speech-form (*oratio obliqua*). In Mundari this is replaced by the direct form: hence the Verb which in English stands in the First Person must in Mundari stand in the Third Person and *vice versa*—

He gave me money in order that *I* should not sue *him* stands thus in Mundari: In order that *he* should not sue *me* saying (to himself) he gave me money,—*Alo-k-ae nalis-iñ-a mente takae omá-iña*.

Whenever circumstances allow, the Predicate which we would expect to follow the forms *alo-k-aing*, etc., is left aside, and these forms are made into complete propositions by adding *a*—

Alo-k-aiñ-a ! Let me not be obliged to it !

Alo-k-ae-a ! Let him not do so ! or Let him not say so !

Alo-k-alang-a ! Let us not do it, let us not say it, let us not go, etc., etc.

Alo-k-aling-a ! Let him and me not be obliged to it !

Alo-k-aking-a ! Let them (the two) not do it, say it, etc.

The Second Persons Singular, Dual and Plural are replaced by the Imperatives *alom*, *alo-ben*, *alo-pe* followed by *a*, v.gr., *alo-m-a* ! Don't ! *Alo-ben-a* ! Don't (you two) ! *Alo-pe-a* ! Don't you !

The Mood-suffix *k* must, I think, be referred to that root which we met in the Indefinite and Interrogative Demonstratives and Pronouns, *oko* and *okoe*. In these words the initial *o* is so short that it may be looked upon as a mere onset. The very function of the words *oko* and *okoe* shows that the root is expressive of doubt and uncertainty. Now if *k* represent that root, then the Mood-suffix would have to be looked upon as fulfilling the function of a *dubitative* or *interrogative* Adverb, similar in meaning to the English *perhaps*. Hence *kami-k-a-ing*,—*Perhaps* I shall work or, *may be* I shall work, i.e., if thou desire or allow it. The Precative as such does indeed directly connote uncertainty, and it connotes this uncertainty as dependent on the good pleasure of some one distinct from the speaker.

The polite Suffix *kó* has plainly the meaning attributed above to the ordinary Suffix *k*, the only difference being that *kó* directly connotes the good pleasure of the person addressed, whereas *k* insists more directly on the uncertainty or doubt. *Dab-kó-me*,—be pleased to sit down. *Dub-kó-a-ing*,—may I sit down please? is equivalent to *I shall sit down if thou be pleased*. The Concessive or Precative *k* and the polite *kó* seem to be but different forms of one and the same Indefinite or Interrogative root, which occurs as *ðko* in the Indefinite and Interrogative Adjectives, as *ko* in the Third Person Plural of the Pronoun, as *k* in the Dual *king*, and again as *ko* in the Plural of Nouns denoting living beings. Indefiniteness and consequently a certain vagueness or uncertainty is the common feature of all these words. It is therefore probable that the *k* which runs through all of them belongs to one and the same original root.

The explanation of the Conditional forms belongs to the Chapter on Subordinate Clauses. (See p. 203.)

MENÁ' AND BANÓ.

Concrete existence and presence in a given place are denoted by *mená*. Non-existence and absence from a given place are denoted by *banó*. In the Present Tense these two words insert the Personal Pronouns between the root and the Impersonal *á*.

The *n* of *banó* is nasalized throughout except in the Impersonal form. Hence *bang* instead of *banó*—

<i>Mená-iñ-a</i> ,	I exist or I am present.	<i>Bang-iñ-a</i> ,	I do not exist or I am absent.
<i>Mená-me-a</i> ,	thou existest.	<i>Bang-me-a</i> ,	thou doest not exist.
<i>Mená-i-a</i> ,	he or she exists.	<i>Bang-di-a</i> ,	he or she does not exist.
<i>Mená</i> ,	it or they (inan. obj.) exist.	<i>Bano-a</i> ,	it or they (inan. obj.) does not exist.
<i>Mená-lang-a</i> ,	thou and I exist.	<i>Bang-lang-a</i> ,	thou and I do not exist.
<i>Mená-ling-a</i> ,	he or she and I exist.	<i>Bang-ling-a</i> ,	he or she and I do not exist.
<i>Mená-len-a</i> ,	you two exist.	<i>Bang-len-a</i> ,	you two do not exist.
<i>Mená-king-a</i> ,	the two exist.	<i>Bang-king-a</i> ,	neither of them exist.
<i>Mená-bv-a</i> ,	you and I exist.	<i>Bang-bv-a</i> ,	you and I do not exist.
<i>Mená-le-a</i> ,	they and I exist.	<i>Bang-le-a</i> ,	they and I do not exist.
<i>Mená-pe-a</i> ,	you exist.	<i>Bang-pe-a</i> ,	you do not exist.
<i>Mená-ko-a</i> ,	they exist.	<i>Bang-ko-a</i> ,	they do not exist.

In the Second Person Singular the form *menám-a* may be used instead of *me-á-me-a*.

Bang-á-íña occurs frequently instead of *bang-íñ-a*; *bang-kú-a* may be substituted for *bang-ko-a*, and in some places they say *bang-ú-i-a*, or *bang-ú-j-a* instead of *bang-á-ia*.

The phrases *to be here*, *to be there*, *not to be here*, *not to be there* are generally rendered by *mená* and *banó* without the Adverbs of Place. These Adverbs are used only when it is desired or necessary to emphasize the exact position. In this case the Adverbs generally take the emphatic Affix *ge* or the Corrective *do* according to the requirements of the proposition—

Nere-ge mená-ko-a, *hanre-do bang-ku-a*,—It is *here* they are, over there they are certainly not.

The phrases *to be still alive* and *to be dead* are very often rendered simply by *mená* and *banó*—

Mená-i-a,—he is still alive. *Soma isu din táete bang-á-ia*—Soma is dead since many years.

Similarly, the phrases, *to be at home* and *not to be at home* are rendered simply by *mená* and *banó*, respectively.

Particularly the Second Person Plural and the Third Person Plural are used to ask or answer the questions. *Are all of you at home?* or *Are all the people of this house at home now?*

Thus *Mená-pe-achi?* *Bau-ingtaking mená-king-a*, *apuingdo bang-á-i-a*. Are all of you at home? My two (senior) brothers are at home, but my father is not, or my father is out. Hence context and circumstances must generally decide whether *mená* means *to exist* or *to be present* or *to be here* or *there*, or *to be at home*, or *to be still alive*. Similarly, the meaning of *banó* depends generally on the context or the circumstances.

Compound Postpositions and Adverbs of Place denoting either *rest* in or *motion* to a place are construed like *mená* when they are used intransitively. Even Nouns denoting places follow the same rule when they have the Suffixes *re* or *te*. In this construction the *e* of *re* or *te* elides with the *i* of *ing* and with the *i* of the 3rd Person Singular.

<i>Ner-íñ-a</i> ,	I am here.	<i>Taiom-re-lang-a</i> ,	Thou and I, he	<i>Orá-re-bu-a</i> ,	You and I,
<i>Ner-re-ma</i> ,	Thou art here.	<i>Taiom-re-ling-a</i> ,	and I, etc.,	<i>Orá-re-le-a</i> ,	they and I,
<i>Ner-ia</i> ,	He(she) is here.	<i>Taiom-re-ben-a</i> ,	are behind.	<i>Orá-re-pe-a</i> ,	etc., are in
<i>Ner-e-a</i> ,	It is here.	<i>Taiom-re-king-a</i> ,		<i>Orá-re-ko-a</i> ,	the house.
<i>Hant-íñ-a</i> ,	} I, thou, he, etc., shall or will go yonder.	<i>Aiar-te-lang-a</i> ,	Thou and I, he	<i>Bir-te-bu-a</i> ,	} You and I, they and I, etc., will or shall go to the forest
<i>Hant-te-m-a</i> ,		<i>Aiar-te-ling-a</i> ,	and I etc.,	<i>Bir-te-le-a</i> ,	
<i>Hant-i-a</i> ,		<i>Aiar-te-ben-a</i> ,	will go on a	<i>Bir-te-pe-a</i> ,	
		<i>Aiar-te-king-a</i> ,	head.	<i>Bir-te-ko-a</i> ,	

Mená has a Continuative Present. *Mená-akange-a-ing*, *mená-akange-am*, *mená-akange-ae*, *menáakange-á*, etc. I am still here, or—I am still alive, or I am still at home, etc.

Banó forms a Past Tense with the Suffix *jan*. In this construction the Personal Pronouns remain suffixed to the root *bang* or *banó* just as in the Present Tense. The very meaning of the form limits it to the Third Person Singular, Dual and Plural: *Banga-i-jana-e*, he died or he has gone away from here and never returned since. *Banó-jan-a*, that thing or those things were lost or destroyed. *Bang-king-jan-a*, both died or went away and never returned. *Bang-ko-jan-a*, they died or they went away and never returned.

Adverbs and Nouns denoting place form a similar Past in *jan* when they take the suffix *te* indicative of motion. This Past Tense occurs in the three Persons and Numbers—

<i>Bir-t-ing-jan-a</i> ,—I went to the forest.	<i>Aiar-te-lang-jan-a</i> ,—thou and I went ahead.
<i>Bir-te-m-jan-a</i> ,—thou wentst to the forest.	<i>Aiar-te-ling-jan-a</i> ,—he and I went ahead.
<i>Bir-t-i-jan-a</i> ,—he went to the forest.	<i>Aiar-te-ben-jan-a</i> ,—you two went ahead.

etc.

Taeken-a is used as Past Tense of *mená*.

Taeken-a-ing,—I existed; I was there; I was at home.

Taeken-a-m,—thou existed; thou wast there; thou wast at home.

Taeken-a-e,—he existed; he was there; he was at home; he was alive.

Taeken-a,—it existed; it was there.

The corresponding Past Tense of *banó* is formed by placing the Negative Particle *ka* with the Pronominal Suffixes before *taeken*—

Ka-ing taekena, *ka-m taekena*, *ka-e taekena*, etc.

The Past of the Adverbial Compounds is formed by placing them with the Pronominal Suffixes before *taeken*—

Nere-ng taekena,—I was here; *Orá-re ka-m taekena*,—Thou wast not at home, etc.

Various words are used to perform the function of Future to *mená* and *banó*—

(1) In their strict meaning—to *exist* or *not to exist*, they take the word *taen* as Future whenever there is question of inanimate objects—

Ne orá api sirma taiomte ka taena,—This house will no longer exist after three years. When there is question of living beings, *jidó*, to be alive, is often used. But *taen* may be used too—

Ne harám api sirma taiomte kae jidóa or *kae taena*,—This old man will not be alive after there years.

(2) When they mean to *be present* or to *be absent*, they borrow their Future either from *taen* or from *namó*, to be found—

Gapa nere kae taena or *nere kae namóa* { he will not be here to-morrow.
 " " " present "

Mená and *banó* are also the Mundari equivalents of the Verbs to *have*, to *possess* and *not to have*, *not to possess*.

The construction to be used when they have this meaning has been explained in the Introduction (page xlv).

Men means to *say*. Although this word may take all the Tense-suffixes, it is frequently used with a Present Tense meaning without Tense-suffix and without Copula for the purpose of quoting replies made by some third person, or in order to emphasize one's own words to some body—

Rear dá mendáchi banoá mente kukkom. Kuliked'koaing, banoá-ko men,—Ask them whether there is fresh water or not. I did ask them *they say that there is none. Kako hijúakana-e men*,—He says that they have not come. *Kaing sena-ing men*,—I tell thee that I won't go. *Chikanam kajila? Kaing bujaubeskeda?*—What didst thou say there? I did not understand well. *Mar-ing sena-ing men*,—I said (just now) all right I shall go, or I said that I would go.

Ka as Transitive or Intransitive Predicate.

When the Negative Particle *ka* is used either transitively or intransitively it is construed like *mená*. It has the Indeterminate Tense, the Future, the Definite and Indefinite Present, the Definite Present

Imperfect and the Indefinite Past with the Suffix *jan*. It may mean *not to be willing, not to agree to something, to refuse—*

INDETERMINATE AND FUTURE : *Ka-iñ-á, ka-m-á, ka-e-á, ka-lang-á*, etc.

DEFINITE OR INTRANSITIVE PRESENT : *Ka-iñ-á-tan-a, ka-m-á-tan-a*, etc., I am unwilling.

TRANSITIVE PRESENT : *Ka-iñ-á-jad-a, ka-m-á-jad-a*,—I refuse it; I don't agree to this or that.

IMPERFECT : *Ka-iñ-á-tan taekena, ka-m-á-tan taekena, ka-e-á-tan-taeken-a*.

PAST : *Ka-iñ-á-jan-a, ka-m-á-jan-a, ka-e-á-jan-a, ka-lang-á-jan-a*, etc.

The Neuter form of the third Person Singular is often used to denote that some inanimate object resists all efforts at producing a certain effect on it. Thus, *v.gr.*, after fruitless attempts at breaking a rock or moving some heavy object, the Munda will say *Ka-e-á!*—It won't break, it won't move! In this form the *e* is purely euphonic.

When it is necessary to specify the refusal denoted by those forms in which the Personal Pronouns are inserted, the bare root of the

<i>Suku,</i>	to be pleased, glad, or satisfied.
<i>Rasika,</i>	to be joyful.
<i>Huringji,</i>	to feel downcast.
<i>Mukupin,</i>	to feel peevish, homesick or lonely.
<i>Chenta,</i>	to be jealous.
<i>Khis,</i>	to feel angry.
<i>Kurkur,</i>	to feel angry.
<i>Kadrau,</i>	to feel impatient or annoyed.
<i>Mamarang,</i>	to feel proud.
<i>Giu,</i>	to feel ashamed.
<i>Sanang,</i>	to desire.
<i>Haia,</i>	} to feel a strong longing or to be hankering after.
<i>Angau,</i>	
<i>Akábakan,</i>	to feel confused or confounded.
<i>Akadanda,</i>	to feel astonished.
<i>Asadi,</i>	to be tired of, to be disgusted with.
<i>Hilang,</i>	to feel a hatred, a horror, a dislike for.
<i>Mönduku,</i>	to feel sorrow, regret for, to repent of.
<i>Renge,</i>	to feel hungry.
<i>Tetang,</i>	to feel thirsty.
<i>Rabang,</i>	to feel cold.
<i>Tufkun,</i>	to feel cool.
<i>Lolo,</i>	to feel hot.
<i>Urgum,</i>	to feel cosily warm.
<i>Jete,</i>	to feel the rays of the sun.

specifying word is placed before the forms, *v.gr.*, *Sen ka-e-á*,—He will refuse to go. *Kami ka-king-á*,—Both of them refuse to work. *Hijá ka-ko-á-tan-a*,—They now refuse to come. *Nir ka-iñ-a-jan-a*,—I refused to run away.

N.B.—The Indeterminate forms *ka-iñ-á*, *ka-m-á*, etc., are generally used with a present meaning. Hence, *v.gr.*, *durang ka-e-á* may mean—

(1) He always refuses to sing (he never sings) ; (2) He will refuse to sing, or (3) He refuses to sing.

Words denoting purely subjective affections, such as *bodily feelings*, *passions* or *states of mind*, are construed *impersonally*. The Pronoun denoting the person who experiences these affections is inserted according to the rules given for *Indirect Pronominal Objects*.

The following list, which contains the greater number of those words, gives, besides the bare root, the first Person Singular of the Future, the Present, and the Simple Past Tenses. The remaining Tenses are also in use:—

suku-aiñ-a.
rasika-aiñ-a.
huringji-aiñ-a.
mukunin-aiñ-a.
chenta-aiñ-a.
khisi-aiñ-a.
kurkur-aiñ-a.
kadrau-aiñ-a.
mamarang-aiñ-a.
giu-aiñ-a.
sanang-aiñ-a.
haia-aiñ-a.
angau-aiñ-a.
akabakan-aiñ-a.
akadanda-aiñ-a.
asadi-aiñ-a.
hilang-aiñ-a.
monduku-aiñ-a.
renge-aiñ-a.
tetang-aiñ-a.
rabang-aiñ-a.
tutkun-aiñ-a.
lolo-aiñ-a.
urgum-aiñ-a.
jete-aiñ-a.

suku-já-iñ-a.
rasika-já-iñ-a.
huringji-já-iñ-a.
mukunin-já-iñ-a.
chenta-já-iñ-a.
khisi-já-iñ-a.
kurkur-já-iñ-a.
kadrau-já-iñ-a.
mamarang-já-iñ-a.
giu-já-iñ-a.
sanang-já-iñ-a.
haia-já-iñ-a.
angau-já-iñ-a.
akabakan-já-iñ-a.
akadanda-já-iñ-a.
asadi-já-iñ-a.
hilang-já-iñ-a.
monduku-já-iñ-a.
renge-já-iñ-a.
tetang-já-iñ-a.
rabang-já-iñ-a.
tutkun-já-iñ-a.
lolo-já-iñ-a.
urgum-já-iñ-a.
jete-já-iñ-a.

suku-k-iñ-a.
rasika k-iñ-a.
huringji-k-iñ-a.
mukunin-k-iñ-a.
chenta-k-iñ-a.
khisi-k-iñ-a.
kurkur-k-iñ-a.
kadrau-k-iñ-a.
mamarang-k-iñ-a.
giu-k-iñ-a.
sanang-k-iñ-a.
haia-k-iñ-a.
angau-k-iñ-a.
akabakan-k-iñ-a.
akadanda-k-iñ-a.
asadi-k-iñ-a.
hilang-k-iñ-a.
monduku-k-iñ-a.
renge-k-iñ-a.
tetang-k-iñ-a.
rabang-k-iñ-a.
tutkun-k-iñ-a.
lolo-k-iñ-a.
urgum-k-iñ-a.
jete-k-iñ-a.

<i>Elang,</i>	to strongly feel the heat emanating from a flame or burning coals.
<i>Balbal,</i>	to perspire.
<i>Turtung,</i>	to feel the glare.
<i>Sukul,</i>	to feel the smoke in one's eyes and throat.
<i>Dulumulu,</i>	to experience those sensations of shivering and which characterise an approaching fever.
<i>Rusurusu,</i>	
<i>Rusumususu,</i>	
<i>Ruarabang,</i>	to have ague (feel hot and cold successively).
<i>Rudbaur,</i>	to feel sick on the stomach; to feel on the point of bringing up.
<i>Uladeo,</i>	
<i>Osobondo,</i>	to feel that peculiar heaviness of limbs and fatigue which precedes an attack of fever.
<i>Tatai,</i>	to feel <i>stiff</i> on account of having continued too long in the same position.
<i>Ruam,</i>	to experience that peculiar <i>itching</i> in a limb arising from continuing too long in the same position.
<i>Gamang,</i>	to experience a ticklish sensation.
<i>Laga,</i>	to feel tired.
<i>Hambal,</i>	to find that something is heavy.
<i>Rabil,</i>	to find that something is light.
<i>Babata,</i>	to itch.
<i>Gutu,</i>	to feel a pricking sensation.
<i>Usur,</i>	to feel a smarting or burning sensation.
<i>Bóbiur,</i>	to feel giddy; <i>literally</i> , to feel one's head turning
<i>Luturhungun,</i>	to have one's ears buzzing.
<i>Tojōrau,</i>	to feel deafened with a noise.
<i>Gungurud',</i>	to feel one's teeth on edge.
<i>Datagamang,</i>	
<i>Mer,</i>	to find something bitter.
<i>Harad',</i>	to find something hot (like pepper).
<i>Jojo,</i>	to find something sour.
<i>Heben,</i>	to find something astringent.
<i>Sirin,</i>	to find something tasting stale.
<i>Soan,</i>	to experience a bad smell.

To these must be added the generic word *at'kar*, to feel, to experience, to be under the impression, to fancy.

The sentence or phrase denoting the subjective affections experienced takes the Suffix *leka*, like, as though, as if, just like, just as if, just as though. This Suffix replaces the Copula *a* of the Predicates, and thus transforms the whole sentence or phrase into a mere Adverbial phrase.

Ruatan-a-ing,—I have fever: hence *Ruatan-leka at'kar-já-tñ-a*,—I feel as if I had fever. *Chiulao kaing lelkie*,—I never saw him: hence

*clang-aiñ-a.**balbal-aiñ-a.**turtung-aiñ-a.**sukul-aiñ-a.**dulumulu-aiñ-a.**rusurusu-aiñ-a.**rusumus-aiñ-a.**ruarabang-aiñ-a.**kud' baur-aiñ-a.**uladeo-aiñ-a.**osobondo-aiñ-a.**tatai-aiñ-a.**ruiam-aiñ-a.**gamang-aiñ-a.**laga-aiñ-a.**hambal-aiñ-a.**rabal-aiñ-a.**babata-aiñ-a.**gutu-aiñ-a.**usur-aiñ-a.**bóbiur-aiñ-a.**laturhungkun-aiñ-a.**toforau-aiñ-a.**gungurud'-aiñ-a.**d. gamang-aiñ-a.**mer-aiñ-a.**harad'-aiñ-a.**jojo-aiñ-a.**heben-aiñ-a.**sirip-aiñ-a.**soan-aiñ-a.**clang-já-iñ-a.**balbal-já-iñ-a.**turtungjá-iñ-a.**sukul-já-iñ-a.**dulumulu-já-iñ-a.**rusurusu-já-iñ-a.**rusumus-já-iñ-a.**ruarabang-já-iñ-a.**kud' baur-já-iñ-a.**uladeo-já-iñ-a.**osobondo-já-iñ-a.**tatai-já-iñ-a.**ruiam-já-iñ-a.**gamang-já-iñ-a.**laga-já-iñ-a.**hambal-já-iñ-a.**rabal-já-iñ-a.**babata-já-iñ-a.**gutu-já-iñ-a.**usur-já-iñ-a.**bóbiur-já-iñ-a.**l.hungkun-já-iñ-a.**toforau-já-iñ-a.**gungurud'-já-iñ-a.**d. gamang-já-iñ-a.**mer-já-iñ-a.**harad'-já-iñ-a.**jojo-já-iñ-a.**heben-já-iñ-a.**sirip-já-iñ-a.**soan-já-iñ-a.**clang-k-iñ-a.**balbal-k-iñ-a.**turtung-k-iñ-a.**sukul-k-iñ-a.**dulumulu-k-iñ-a.**rusurusu-k-iñ-a.**rusumus-k-iñ-a.**ruarabang-k-iñ-a.**kud' baur-k-iñ-a.**uladeo-k-iñ-a.**osobondo-k-iñ-a.**tatai-k-iñ-a.**ruiam-k-iñ-a.**gamang-k-iñ-a.**laga-k-iñ-a.**hambal-k-iñ-a.**rabal-k-iñ-a.**babata-k-iñ-a.**gutu-k-iñ-a.**usur-k-iñ-a.**bóbiur-k-iñ-a.**l.hungkun-k-iñ-a.**toforau-k-iñ-a.**gungurud'-k-iñ-a.**d. gamang-k-iñ-a.**mer-k-iñ-a.**harad'-k-iñ-a.**jojo-k-iñ-a.**heben-k-iñ-a.**sirip-k-iñ-a.**soan-k-iñ-a.*

Ohiulao kaing lelkileka atkar-já-iñ-a,—I am under the impression that I never saw him.

Gel gaudi-ng senakada,—I have done ten leagues, or I have continued marching ten leagues: hence, *Gel gaudi senakad'-lena at'kar-k-iñ-a*,—I felt as though I had been marching ten leagues.

All the above words must be construed *personally* when they take the Causatives *rika* or *iri*, v.gr., *huringji-rika*, to cause some one to feel

discouraged; *khis-iri* to cause some one to get angry. Pronouns are inserted as *Direct Objects*, *v.gr.*, *giu-rika-ked'-ko-a-e*, he made them ashamed, he shamed them.

The following when construed personally either insert Indirect Pronominal Objects, or they take Objects introduced by *tá* and *táte* outside the Predicate:—

Suku, to like some one; *suku-ai-tan-a-ko* or *adáte-ko suku-tana*, they like him.

Chenta, to envy; *chenta-ako-a-e*, he will envy them.

Khisió, to be angry with; *khisi-ale-a-ko* or *ale-tá-ko khisi-ó-a*, they will be angry with us.

Kurkur, to be angry with; *kurkur-ad'-ko-a-e*, he got angry with them.

Boro, to be afraid of; *boro-am-tan-a-le*, we are afraid of thee.

The following are used as Transitive Predicates:—

Lolo, to heat; *tutkun*, to cool; *urgum*, to warm; *rabang*, to make cold.

Mer, to give a bitter taste to something by means of a particular ingredient.

Harad', to give a hot taste to something by means of a hot ingredient.

Jojo, to give an acid taste to something by means of tamarind.

Hasu, to be sick, and *rua* to have fever, are construed personally.

Hasutan-a-ing, I am sick, but *hasu-ja'-in-a*, it hurts or pains me.

Renge when construed personally means *to be poor*; *Renge-tun-a-ko*, they are poor; *renge-len-a-ko*, they had been poor; *renge-jan-a-ko*, they have become poor.

Suku construed personally means to be satisfied, to be happy, to be pleased; *Suku-tan-a-le*, we are satisfied; *Suku-jan-a-ko*, they were satisfied and are so still; *Suku-len-a-ko*, they were satisfied then.

Since the correct rendering of the English Verb *to be* presents considerable difficulties to the foreign student, it seems advisable to resume into a few rules all that has been said here and there in the preceding pages about the manner in which Mundari Predicates are connected with their Subjects—

1st—Whenever the Verb *to be* is synonymous with *to exist*, *to be still* *alive*, *to be present*, *to be at home* it is rendered by *mená*. In the corresponding negative proposition it is rendered by *banó*—

There is a God,—*Pormesor menáia*. There are no witches,—*Nájomko bangkua*. Is thy father still alive? *Apum menáia chi*? The village-chief and the sacrificer are not present,—*Munda pahan'king bangkinga*.—My brother is not at home,—*Bawing bangáia*.

Mená is frequently replaced by the construction explained on page 113 when there is question of *presence* in a particular place which is designated either by a Noun or an Adverb of Place.

Banó can never be replaced by this construction—

They *are* here,—*Nere menákoa* or *Nerekoa*. Negat. *Nere bangkua*.
He *is* in the house,—*Oṛáre menáia* or *Oṛária*. Negat. *Oṛáre bangáia*.
Where *is* the axe? *Hake okore mená* or *Hake okorea*.

2nd—Whenever the Verb *to be* is a mere *link-word* it is rendered either by *tan* or by *a* according to the following rules:—

1. When the Verb *to be* stands as Copula in a sentence where the Predicate is a Noun or Pronoun primarily and directly denoting an individual or a species or a genus it must be rendered by *tan*.

Who *is* this? *Ni okoi tani*? This *is* Pasana of Sarwada,—*Ni Sarwadaren Pasana toni*. Are these Mundas or Uraons? *Niku Horoko tan-ko chi Uraonko*? It *is* a sâl tree,—*Sarjom taná*. It *is* himself, *Inige tani*.

2. When the Verb *to be* stands as Copula in a sentence where the Predicate is an Adjective or a Participle, it must be rendered by *a*. This *a* is always suffixed to the Predicate. Adjective Predicates very frequently take the emphatic *ge* as Suffix.

It *is* black, *Hendea* or *hendegea*. This man *is* tall,—*Ne horo salangigede*. Some *are* good, others *are* bad,—*Tara ko bugigeako tarako et'kageako*.

Here it must be remembered that many Mundari equivalents of English Adverbs are treated as Intransitive Predicates. Of these, most stand in the Perfect or Continuative Present Tense—

He *is* rich, *Pungiakanae*; literally, he *is* enriched. This knife *is* sharp,—*Ne katu leserakana*; literally, *is* sharpened or has been sharpened. Some stand in the Intransitive Present—

He *is* poor, *Rengetanae*; literally, He *hungers* or he *wants*. They *are* sick, *Hasutanako*.

3. When the Verb *to be* stands as Copula in a sentence where the Predicate is a *Noun* primarily denoting an individual, but *directly* connoting a *dignity*, an *office* or a *state of dependence*, it must be rendered by *á*. In this case the Mundari equivalent of the English Noun is treated as an Intransitive Predicate and stands in the Perfect Tense—

Who *is* chief in this village? *Ne hature okoi mundaakanae ?*
 These two *are* the servants of the sacrificer,—*Niking pahanrtáreking dasinkana*. He *is* the king of this country,—*Ini ne disumree rajaakana*.

REMARK.—It often happens that the *dignity* or *office* connoted by these Nouns is entirely neglected, and that the designation of the individuality is solely intended by the speaker. In this case the Mundari equivalent of the English Noun retains the function of a Noun and is connected with its Subject by means of the Copula *tan*.

Who *is* this man? *Ne horo okoi tani ?* He is the chief of Sarwada,—*Sarwadaren Munda tan*. Who are these two young men? *Ne dangra king okoi-king ?* They are my servants,—*Aiñá dasiking tanking*.

FUNCTION OF REDUPLICATION.

Reduplication consists in the repetition of the first syllable of a Transitive or Intransitive Predicate, *v.gr.*, *dál*, *da-dál*; *sen*, *se-sen*—

Words beginning with a simple or an aspirated vowel reduplicate, not by a distinct repetition of that vowel, but by lengthening it, *v.gr.*, *híjü*, *híjü*; *aium*, *aium*.

This simple lengthening of the vowel in the first syllable is very freely used even in words beginning with a consonant, *v.gr.*, *dál* for *da-dál*; *sén* for *sesen*.

Certain words beginning with a consonant do not admit of real reduplication. Lengthening of the first vowel is all they allow, *v.gr.*, *jagar*, *jāgar*, never *jajagar*. *Si*, to plough, is rarely reduplicated, *sisi* being hardly ever heard. If its first syllable is lengthened, it is followed by *u*. Hence *siu* is equivalent to *sisi*.

Reduplication is used—

1st.—To denote *natural dispositions* or *habits*, *customs*, and *natural phenomena*. With this function it naturally occurs chiefly in the Indeterminate Tense. It may in fact be stated as almost a general rule that the Indeterminate Tense-form reduplicates or lengthens its

first syllable. It is by this that it is chiefly distinguishable from the Simple Future—

Ne hoꝛo dadalae, or *dālae*,—This man is in the habit of beating or this man is quick to beat. *En jo kaho jajoma*, or *jōma*,—They do not eat that fruit, i.e., that fruit is never eaten or it is not eatable. *Asarre gāmaeae*, in Asar (middle of June to middle of July) it (always) rains.

2nd.—It is used to denote an attempt at something or a purpose to begin something. In this case the reduplicated Predicate either takes the Locative Suffix *te*, to, and is followed by *sen*, to go, or it takes the construction explained on pages 173 and 174 without *sen*.

Neneltēng sena or *neneltiña*, } I shall go to see.
Nēltēng sena or *nēltiña*,

Āumte-bu sena or *āumte-bu-a*,—You and I will go to listen.

In the Imperative the Exhortative Particle *dola* generally takes the Personal Pronominal Suffix: *Dola-bu nenette*,—Let us (you and I) go to see. However, the other constructions are also used. Thus *Dola! siu-te-bu-a!* or *Dola! siu-te-bu sena!* Come! let us (you and I) go to plough.

3rd.—It is used to denote successful beginnings: *Ne hone sesena* or *sēna*,—This child begins to walk.

This particular phrase is used in the Perfect Tense with a slightly different meaning. *Ne hon sesenakanae*,—This child has learnt to walk or, can walk. *Ne koꝛa nadoe ōla*,—Now this boy begins to write.

FORMATION OF COMPOUND PRIMARY (PREDICATIVE) ELEMENTS.

In the preceding chapters we have seen how the secondary or formative elements agglutinate with the primary or predicative elements for the purpose of forming integral and intelligible parts of a sentence.

The present chapter shows how new primary elements are obtained either by the concurrence of several predicative roots or by the concurrence of a predicative with a demonstrative (formative) root.

In Mundari these Compound Primary elements are obtained by mere juxtaposition of two complete roots or words, *v.gr.*, *sadom-ʒó*, horse-head; *sen-aiar*, precede.

In Organic Compounds of this kind there *always* exists a *functional interdependence* between the component parts. Thus in the compound *horse-head* the first Noun acts as a *Qualificative* of the second. In *fore-see* *fore* acts as a *Modification* of the Verb. Hence we may say that in these Compound words one of the components does in a way assume the function of a formative element, although it be a predicative root and although the result of the composition be itself a primary element which in its totality is as susceptible of the ordinary secondary or formative elements as any simple root or word.

Mundari forms similar compounds, and it does so even more extensively than Organic languages. But besides these, it forms a set of Compound words in which the component elements are not only materially juxtaposed, but also functionally *co-ordinate*, *i.e.*, neither of the juxtaposed words acts as specification or modification to the other. These co-ordinate Compound words are of two kinds—

1st—Natural or conventional groups of men or animals or collections of objects, such as, *v.gr.*, sets of implements, are denoted by juxtaposing the names of two individuals of the group or the names of two objects of the collection.

In analogous expressions of Organic languages the Conjunctive Particle must be used, *v.gr.*, *kith and kin*; *goods and chattels*.

2nd—Many of these co-ordinate Compounds are used to directly denote quite a *distinct idea* which we generally express by means of an *Abstract Noun*. The idea thus denoted arises by implication from the collection originally signified.

I here subjoin a list of such Compounds which give a fair idea of the Munda's degree of civilization and of his ambitions, fears, and pleasures:—

Enga-apu (mother and father), *parents*.

Haram-buria (the old man and the old woman), *the heads of the family*.

Hon-hopon (child and grandchild), *the children of the house*. This includes daughters-in-law as well as any adopted children.

Boko-boea (brother and sister), applied to all the children of the same parents without distinction of sex or seniority. It is equivalent to the German word *Geschwister*.

Misia-barea (sister and brother). Like *bokoboera*, *the children of the same parents*.

Hon-buri (child and old woman), *wife and children*.

Hon-mis (child and sister), *female relations*.

Dasi-guti (servant and slave), *dependants, c.fr., the Latin familia.*

Munda-pahan? (chief and sacrificer), *the authorities of the village.*

Raja-ṭakur (rajah and ṭakur), *the authorities of the land (includes all official persons).*

Raja-parja (the king and peasant), *the whole population.*

Rayat-parja (tenants with and tenants without occupancy right) *the subjects.*

Bing-kiding (snake and scorpion), *venomous reptiles (includes centipedes and bad spiders).*

Jiu-jantu (life and beast)—*1st, every living thing (except man); 2nd, everything living that cannot fly (except man).*

Chenṛe-chipurud' (bird and ?), *the birds of the air, v. gr., Nida dipli jiu-jantuko sēnbara chenṛe-chipurudko dūruma.*

Ote-sahan (land and firewood), *wealth in immoveable property.*

Daru-sing (tree and tree), *orchard (includes all fruit trees).*

Dhan-kuryi (a bag in which goods are packed and loaded on pack-bullocks and goods), *wealth in moveable property.**

Taka-paisa (rupees and pice), *cash, ready money, riches.*

Uri-merom (ox and goat), *cattle.*

Sim-sukuri (fowl and hog). This is a complement to uri-merom, and implies that a man's *farmyard and poultry* is all that can be desired.

Uri-aranṛan (bullock and yoke), *wealth in cattle (it implies that a man is rich in cattle, and that he can turn out several yokes of oxen).*

Sadom-chatom (horse and umbrella), *greatness, highest wealth.*

Sadomchatom menāteni, *a great man, an aristocrat (literally, one possessing a pony and an umbrella).*

Kutum-kupul (relations and friends), } *Good and extensive family connexions, good social position.*

Haga-boea (relations and brothers),

Kutum kupulko menākoataia,—He is a man of good connexions, i.e., he is received as a guest (with rice beer) in many families.

Tari-ḷoṭa (a brass-plate and a brass vessel) is the Mundari equivalent of *crockery and plate of a wealthy European family. It*

* This expression is purely Hindi. The Mundas never use bullocks for the purpose of carrying anything.

implies a house where the meals are served in the best style.

Sakam-karkad' (leaf and tooth-cleaner, *i.e.*, a thin stick of green sál-wood is turned into a tooth-brush by chewing one end of it for a while. Some leaves are stitched together with wooden needles so as to form a kind of dish. In this dish the food is placed). This Compound might be said to denote the ordinary man's *table-service* if the Mundas possessed any tables. As it is the Mundas squat on the ground to eat. The fingers of the right hand serve as spoon and fork.

Chatu-lundi (earthen pot and ladel), *cooking utensils.*

Haṭā-tunki (winnowing-shovel and basket), *the housewife's working utensils.*

Naiṭ-araṇṇan (plough and yoke), *the cultivators' gear.*

Nangili-pal (a leather strap wherewith plough is attached to yoke and a plough share), *the cultivators' gear.*

Gainti kud'lam (pickaxe and hoe), *the earth-worker's implements.*

A-sar (bow and arrow), *a bow.*

Kapi-taṇauri (axe and sword),

A-sar-kapi (bow, arrow and axe),

} *Weapons, armaments.*

Lijā-sini (cloth and ?), *a good wardrobe (implies wealth).*

Sered'-lijā (a rag and a cloth), *the necessary clothing.*

Mandī-ulu (cooked rice and stew), *abundant food.* Mandīutu mendlent,—One who has a good fare.

Ilī-saba (rice beer and dregs), *a grand dinner.*

Aṛā-sakam (herbs and leaves, *i.e.*, the leaves of some trees which are eaten), *vegetables.*

Tasad'-busu (grass and straw), *abundant fodder for cattle.*

Sunum-bulung (oil and salt), *the bare necessities of life.* Sunum bulung kam purauaire chikanamentem dokia! is a frequent reproach of the mother-in-law: Why didst thou marry my daughter if thou canst or wilt not give her even *the bare necessities of life!*

Bulung-tamaku (salt and tobacco), *the weekly market purchases, the weekly bazar.*

Orā-duar (house and door), *one's circumstances (of poverty, ease or wealth), especially used in the expression: Orāduar nenel,*

to go and enquire into some one's circumstances before arranging a marriage. With *mená* without any qualification it means *to be established in life, to have a house and home of one's own.*

Susun-karam (dance and karam, *i.e.*, a certain religious ceremony used in many parts), *a feast.*

Dumang dangiri (drum and girl), *a dance.*

Gara-dora (river and ravine), *broken ground.*

Buru-bera (mountain and plain), *everywhere, all over.*

Dub-tingun (to sit and to stand), *to be on speaking terms, to be friendly with*, *v.gr.*, *Nido aleló dubtinguno kacá*,—This man is on bad terms with us, *i.e.*, he does not even sit or stand with us.

Nála-tumbal (to work for wages and to glean), *to live from hand to mouth*, *v.gr.*, *nado nalatumbaltele asulótana*,—We are now living from hand to mouth.

Gérang-ruud' (to moan and to pine), *to be in great pain, severe illness.* *En oráre gérang-ruud'-tangeako*,—There is severe illness in that house.

Ol-parau (to write and read), *learning, education*, *v.gr.* *Ol-parauakanae*, he has a good education; he is a learned man. (Note the Passive form; *literally*, he is a written and read man.)

Adjectives are similarly co-ordinated without any Conjunctive Particle.

Hendeará, black and white; *pundiara*, white and red.

ORDINARY COMPOUND WORDS.

I.—Compound Nouns.

In these Nouns the specifying word stands first just as in English, *v.gr.*, *oráduar*, house-door; *sadombó*, horse-head. This kind of composition is used more extensively in Mundari than in English. Hence the specifying Noun has sometimes to be translated into English by an Adjective, sometimes even by a Relative Clause: *Birsim*, a wild fowl; *birsukuri*, a wild boar; *birhoro*, a caste of men who live exclusively in the forests. *Hatusim*, a tame fowl.

Sometimes it must be translated by a Noun depending on a Preposition, or even by an Adverbial phrase—

Chatomorá (*chatom*, an umbrella), a house with a roof like an umbrella, *i.e.*, with a roof sloping down on all four sides.

The formation of Compound Nouns by means of the Pronominal Affixes *i* (*ni*), *king* and *ko* to the Possessive forms in *ren* or *ten* has been explained in the chapter on Equivalents of Declensions (pages 94, 95, and 96) and on Possessive Adjectives.

Instrumental Nouns are formed by suffixing the Impersonal Pronoun *á*, *it*, *something* to the Instrumental Case of Participles. These Participles may stand in the Indeterminate, the Present or the Past Tenses. *Ka* may be prefixed like the *a* privativum. *Lúmó*, to get wet. *Ka-lúmóted*, a water-proof, *i.e.*, something by means of which one won't get wet.

Uiugó, to fall: *Ka-úiugóted*, a parapet, *i.e.*, something by means of which one won't fall.

Ol, to write. *Óléd*, writing materials (paper, pen, and ink). *Ne pata olkented*,—The pen with which this deed was written. *Botoé*, a waist-cloth for men to cover one's self decently. Hence *botoén* (Reflexive Voice) to tie a cloth round one's own waist. Hence *botoénted*, a cloth wherewith to cover one's self decently. *Suru*, to shelter. *Surun*, to shelter one's self. *Surunted*, a shelter against rain or sun, an umbrella or anything of that kind.

Nouns denoting materials are obtained by adding the Impersonal Pronoun *á* to the bare root or to the Passive in *ó*. An *e* is generally inserted between the bare root and *á*.

Jom, to eat, *jomed*, eatables. *Her*, to sow; *heréd*, seed grains; *heró*, to be sown; *heróá*, land to be sown.

II.—Compound Predicates.

In most cases the modifying word, whether predicative or demonstrative, stands second.

(1) *Compounds consisting of a Predicative root and a Postposition.*—In Mundari the Compound Postpositions denoting *rest* or *motion* to or from are freely used by themselves alone as Transitive or Intransitive Predicates. In these cases Predicative roots denoting *motion*, such as *sen*, *nir*, etc., and equivalents or synonyms of the Verb to *put*, such as

do, etc., are generally to be understood from the context or the circumstances, *v.gr.*, *aiar*, to put something or some one before some one else (*anteponere*)—*Aiaró*, to be ahead, to go ahead. *Taiom*, to place behind (*postponere*), to put off. *Taiomó*, to lag behind, to be left behind. *Chetan*, to put or place above or to raise up. *Chetanó*, to be raised, to be above.

On account of this use of the Postpositions, Compound Predicates, consisting of a Predicative root and a Postposition, are comparatively rare in Mundari; *Aiar*, *sida* and *parom* are almost the only Postpositions used freely in Compounds; *lelaiar*, to look ahead, to foresee; *aiumsida*, to first hear and to be the first to hear; *nirparom*, to run across.

Such words as the Latin *retrospicere*, *superponere* must be rendered by using the Postpositions adverbially, *v.gr.*, *taiomsáte lel*, to look backwards; *chetanre do*, to put above or upon or on top of.

Transfer of Postpositions to the moral or ideal sphere having hardly begun in Mundari, such Compounds as *to suppose*, *to respect*, *to imply*, *to condescend*, etc., etc., do not exist.

Some of these words can hardly be rendered at all in Mundari; others must be rendered by circumlocutions, and some of the ideas denoted are expressed by distinct words, chiefly of foreign origin, *v.gr.*, *chema*, to condone, to pardon; *manating*, to respect; *puja*, to adore, to worship; *mārang*, to exalt, to praise.

A very common way of forming Compounds consists in juxtaposing two and sometimes three Transitive or Intransitive Predicates. The Voice, Mood, and Tense-suffixes are added to the last of the juxtaposed words. In these Compounds the first word generally performs the function of a modifying *Participial Clause of Cause or Manner*. Hence it can frequently be rendered into English by means of the word *by* introducing a Participle. However, other modes of rendering the modifying or first part of these Compounds must occasionally be used as the following examples will show:—

Buló, to be drunk. *durum*, to sleep. Hence *buldurumó*, to fall asleep on account of being drunk, to fall asleep in a fit of drunkenness. *Jetana kae mundia, buldurumakanae*,—He won't understand anything: he is asleep in a fit of drunkenness.

Hered', to weed; *nala*, to gain a daily wage. Hence *hered'nala*,—to earn one's (daily) sustenance by weeding (other people's rice-fields).

Tiga, to tread, to trample; *nam*, to find, to discover. Hence *tiganam*, to find or discover something by treading on it. *Hola aiub ne chakuang tiganamlá*,—Yesterday evening I found this penknife by treading on it. *Bagrau*, to spoil. Hence *tigabagrau*,—to spoil something by trampling on it. *Birsukuriko bahataeko tigabagraukeda*,—The wild boars have destroyed his paddy by trampling on it.

Rebed', to force or squeeze in between; *goé*, to kill; *gojó* (for *goed*), to die. Hence *rebed'goé*,—to kill by squeezing between two objects, and *rebed'gojó*, to be killed by being squeezed. *En kera huangre uiijanchie rebed'goéjana*,—That buffalo falling into a precipice was killed by being jammed (between two rocks).

N.B.—Although the word *rebed'* in this example be itself in the Passive Voice, it does not take a separate Passive Affix—

Har, to drive; *urung*, to take, bring, or carry out, to cause to go out. Hence *harurung*, to drive out, to expel.

Ader, to take, bring or carry inside, to cause to go inside. Hence *harader*, to drive in.

Tuing, to shoot an arrow; *goé*, to kill. Hence *tuinggoé*, to kill with an arrow.

Tofe, to shoot with a gun. Hence *totegoé*, to kill with a gunshot.

Tam, to strike with a club or stick. Hence *tamgoé*, to kill with clubs or sticks.

Gara, to dig. Hence *garaurung*, to dig out, to unearth.

Topa, to bury. Hence *topagoé*, to bury alive, i.e., to kill by burying.

Kaji, to say, to speak; *denga*, to help. Hence *kajidenga*, to help by speaking (for some one), to plead, to intercede for. This is always Transitive in Mundari: *Jetaeo kako kajidengajáia*,—There is nobody to intercede or plead for him.

Si, to plough. Hence *sidenga*, to help somebody to plough.

The examples given above suffice to familiarize the student with this kind of formation to which there is, so to say, no limit in Mundari. However, certain compounds belonging to this class present greater difficulties to the foreigner, not only because they cannot be translated

literally into any Aryan language, but also because it is impossible to lay down any uniform or general rule for their translation.

Lá denotes *excess* in general. It may be used as a Quantitative Adjective. In this case the *terminus* which is exceeded takes the Suffix *ete*, v.gr., *Sai takaete láge*,—More than one hundred rupees *Iniete láe kuril daria*,—He can jump further (or higher) than that one.

Lá is frequently used as an independent Predicate. If so, the particular act in which the excess takes place is gathered from the context or the circumstances. *Lákedako* (transitive) may denote an excess of any kind, v.gr., they dug further or deeper, they rose higher, they went or ran further, etc., etc.

When it is desirable or necessary to *specify*, i.e., to explicitly state the nature of the act in which an excess takes place, then a compound is formed by placing the word denoting that act before *lá*. But the terminus which is exceeded is generally not expressed in Mundari, and since in these compounds *lá* does not denote an *absolute* but a relative excess, the terminus must generally be rendered into English by some circumlocution.

Jom-lákedako,—literally, they exceeded in eating. But this does not imply an absolute excess. Hence it does not mean *they ate too much*, but it means *they ate more than their usual amount*.

Om-láad'koae,—literally, he exceeded in giving to them. This means either: he gave them *more than he owed them*, or: *more than he usually does*.

When *lá* concurs in this way with an *Intransitive* Predicate, the resulting compound becomes *Transitive*. Hence the Transitive Tense-suffixes must be used in the Past Tenses, v.gr., *Sen-lákedae*,—He went beyond this or that terminus.

When the terminus which is exceeded is expressed, it takes the Suffix *ete*, v.gr., *Holaetee jomlákeda*,—He ate more than he did yesterday.

Bage means to abandon, to relinquish. In compounds it assumes two different meanings:—

- (1) It may retain the original meaning just quoted. In this case the compound may be rendered into English either (a) by a co-ordinate compound sentence in which the equivalents of the words constituting the Mundari

Predicate are connected by means of the Conjunction and—*Ne lijāe huduma-bagekeda*,—He threw this cloth away and left it there; *Gopoé etéjanchi Soma sangikotae nir-bageked'koa*,—As soon as the fight began Soma ran away and abandoned his companions. (b) Either word of the Mundari compound may be rendered by a Participial clause: *Sangikotae nirbageked'koa*,—He ran away, abandoning his companions, or, he abandoned his companions by running away.

N.B.—A very remarkable feature of these compounds consists in the fact that, although the compound, as a grammatical unit, be Transitive, the Intransitive part may still have its own Locative Case. *Et'kan kurie taikena, honko Assamtee nir-bagetad'koa*,—She was a bad creature: she abandoned her children and ran away to Assam.

- (2) *Bage* may mean to leave undone. These compounds, like those described under (1), cannot be translated literally by a corresponding English Compound Predicate. They may be rendered either (a) by a Negative proposition in which the equivalent of the first word in the Mundari compound stands as Predicate, whereas *bage* is simply translated by the Negative Particle *not* or by the phrase *not to do*. *Daru japare si-bagekedako*,—They did not plough (the spot) close to the tree. *Ne upan kaji ol-bageakadae*,—He has not written these four words.

In Imperative propositions *bage* is generally equivalent to the Prohibitive Particle *alo!* *Daru japare si-bagetam!* Don't plough close to the tree! *Jilu jombagetam, kam sukuredo!* If thou do not like it (meat), then don't eat the meat. This implies that meat is mixed up with the food served, and has consequently to be left aside by the peculiar process of eating what is with it.

(b) The Compounds may be translated by rendering *bage* by means of *to leave*, *to omit*. In this case the first part of the Compound must be rendered either by a Passive Participle with the Prefix *un* or by an Infinitive Clause—

Daru japare si-bagekedako,—They left (the spot) near the tree unploughed. *Ne upunia kajje ol-bagekeda*,—He omitted to write these four words, or, he omitted these four words when writing.

Saré means to leave over; saré,—to remain over, to be over. In Compounds it is, like bage, used with two distinct meanings—

(1) It may keep its original meaning. In that case the first part of the Mundari Compound is reduplicated, *v. gr.*, ool-saré, joom-saré, lald-saré, siu-saré. In rendering these Compounds the equivalent of saré stands as Predicate, whereas the reduplicated first part is translated by an Active or a Passive Infinitive Clause.

Aiub'mente huringlekaing joom-sareakada,—I have kept or left a little over to eat in the evening. Etd sanjmente bar priste ool-saré akada,—He has left two pages over to be written this afternoon (he has left for this afternoon two pages to be written).

(2) Saré is sometimes used as a synonym of bage in the Compounds described on page 192 under (2). In this case the first part of the Compound is not reduplicated—

Daru japare si-sarétam, or si-bagetam,—Don't plough close to the tree. Jilu jom-sarékedae, or jom-bagekedae,—He did not eat the meat (which was mixed with his food).

Urum is not used independently. Added to words denoting sense perceptions, it means to recognize: thus lel-urum,—to recognize by sight; aium-urum,—to recognize by hearing; soan-urum or ji-urum,—to recognize by smelling; jom-urum,—to recognize by the taste; chapu-urum,—to recognize by the touch; chapad-urum,—to recognize by the feeling an object causes on the sole of the foot when it is trodden on.

Since there is no general term equivalent to the English Verb to recognize, the foreign student must be careful to prefix the right word to urum in every particular case. A few examples by way of illustration—

Will you recognize those men if you see them? En horokom lelurumkoachi? (Here the clause *if you see them* is sufficiently rendered by the word lel). I did not see him, but I recognized his voice,—Leldo kaing lelkie mendo aiumurumkiaing. Sonchita ne lataria, soanurumjdiaing,—The leopard is in this den: I recognize him by the smell.

The following deserve special notice on account of the change of meaning which, from our point of view, they undergo when added to other Predicates:—

Au (*agu*) means *to bring, to fetch*. In Compounds it is used with two distinct meanings—

(1) It primarily denotes a motion from a distance to the speaker or to a fixed point. Thus it is synonymous with *ete., from*. Hence when suffixed to a Predicate, it implies that the action or effect denoted by that Predicate is conceived as approaching the speaker, *v. gr., Soanjāinā,—I perceive a smell. Soan-aujāinā,—I perceive a smell coming from a distance in this direction. Lel, to see. Hence lel-aujād'koaing,—I see them coming this way; lel-aiiaing,—I shall wait here to see him come in*. These examples suffice to show how much the hearer has to gather from context and circumstances for a correct understanding of these Compounds as well as for a correct rendering into English. Like *ete, from*, the above primary meaning of *au* in Compounds may be transferred to time. If so, *au* implies that the action denoted by the first part of the Compound has been going on from a more or less remote past up to the present time with a physical or moral continuity—

Ne haturenko modhisi sirmatāete malko omaujada aingtā,—The people of this village have always paid their rent to me for the last twenty years. Nēado nangrenkotāete aiim-aujana,—This is a tradition since time immemorial; literally, this has always been heard from those of former or olden times.

(2) *Au*, inasmuch as it is equivalent to the English *to fetch*, i.e., *to go and bring*, implies a *going from one place* for the purpose of performing the action denoted by the first part of the Compound, and then an *immediate return* to the place one had left. These Compounds can neither be rendered literally into English, nor yet always by the same kind of circumlocution.

Auri heu! dāing nu-au-k-a! Wait a moment hey! till I have been for a drink! *Literally, Not yet hey! (i.e., don't start as yet). Let me go to drink and return (to you).*

Ju lel-aume! Go and bring news, i. e., *Go, see what is going on and return to inform me or us.*

Aege aium-aulde,—He has been to bring news, i.e., he has been to hear by himself (what was being said or done) and has come back to report it. *Lijákole nur-aukóa*! May we go, please, to wash our clothes!

N.B.—From the Munda's point of view *au* does not undergo any change of meaning. He seems to conceive the first part of the Compound substantively—*Nu*, a drink; *lel*, a look; *aium*, a hearing; *nur*, a wash. Hence to him *nu-au*, *lel-au*, *aium-au*, *nur-au* means, literally, to bring or to fetch a drink; to bring or to fetch a look (at something), to bring or fetch a hearing, to bring a wash.

Idi means to take something or some one to some place or person. In Compounds it denotes a continuation or a constant repetition of the action denoted by the first word of the Compound—

Parau-idime! Continue reading; literally, take the reading further on. *Setako han daru habi solka-idikiako*,—The dogs continued or kept biting (the bullock) up to yonder tree.

N.B.—*Niridi* simply denotes a running from, just as *nirau* denotes a running to the speaker. *Niridíde*,—He ran to such or such a place or person.

Peré means to fill. It is added to other Predicates with its original meaning, but in a manner in which we would hardly expect it. In translations *peré* must be rendered separately either by the Verb to fill or by the Adjective full or sometimes by the Adverb entirely or the phrase in full, v.gr., *Dub'-perélako*,—The whole place was full of people sitting down; [literally;—They sat (the place) full]. *Turu-perékiako*,—They stung him all over. *Hal-peréad'koae*,—He paid them in full, i.e., as much as he owed them.

Giri means to throw away. Added to other Predicates, it denotes a Superlative degree, an excess or a climax. It is generally synonymous with the Superlative Affix *uter*, but it is used only to denote mental or physical states. *Bahu-giríjanako balu-uterjanako*,—They got utterly dumbfounded. *Abuá kajite miad' kitab peré-giríkedabutaia*,—We have filled entirely one of his books with our words. *Ne daru cham-giríakana*,—This tree is entirely seasoned.

En inung mukunin-giríjanaing,—I am perfectly disgusted with that game.

Pharchi means to cleanse, to clean away. In Compounds it becomes synonymous with the Superlative Affix *uter*.

Whereas *giri* in Compounds always denotes a *state* as the result of some action, *pharchi* exhibits the action itself as carried right through to its natural terminus or completion.

Misa gitite ang-pharchiaing,—(If I) once get to lie down I *dawn* it entirely. *Ang* means *dawn*; used intransitively it means to continue till daybreak. In the above sentence the Predicate *ang* derives its particular meaning from its proximity to *gitite*, which means *to go to sleep* (*literally*, to go to lie down). Hence here *ang* means to continue to sleep till daybreak. *Pharchi* added to *ang* implies that the sleeping is not interrupted even for a single moment. Hence the sentence may be rendered thus: Once I go to sleep, I never wake till daybreak.

Riring-pharchikedaing,—I have entirely forgotten it, I can't remember *anything* of it, however much I may try to.

Bai means *to make*, to arrange, to prepare, *v. gr.*, *Orale baitana*,—We are busy making (building) a house.

In Compounds it keeps this signification whenever it stands first. *Nekate bai-biurkako*,—Let them arrange it right around in this way. *Pachrie bai-rakab'keda*,—He has raised the walls (*literally*, he made the walls up to the top).

When *bai* stands second in Compounds, it becomes equivalent to the English Adverbs: *carefully*, *properly*, *well*, *one by one*.

Biur-baikako,—Let them turn it round *carefully*. *Entedoko rakab'-baikeda*,—Then they raised it *carefully*. *Kaing arum-baikeda*,—I did not hear it *properly*. *Ne jo halang-baibe*,—Gather up these fruits *one by one*.

Hundi means to *gather, to collect*. It keeps this meaning in Compounds when it stands first. But when it stands second it becomes equivalent to the English *many, plenty*. *Duarbu ni-hundita!* Let us open *plenty of outlets or doors*.

The English Verbs to see, to hear, to feel, and their synonyms have often an Infinitive or a Participial Clause as Direct Objects, *v. gr.*, I saw *him come in*; I heard *him singing*. The corresponding Mundari words *lel*, *aum*, and *at'kar* differ from each other in their construction.

Lel admits of four different constructions:—

1st.—It may take a *Participle* as modifying a Pronominal Direct Object. The Object itself is of course inserted into *lel*: I saw him Ploughing that field,—*En piri sitan-ing lek-t-a*.

2nd.—The same construction may be used with this difference that the bare Participle takes the Postposition *re*, and is consequently transformed into an Adverbial Clause of Time: *En piri sitanre-ng lek-t-a*,—I saw him *when he was ploughing* that field.

Both these constructions are, however, ambiguous because the Participle may refer to the Subject as well as the Object, so that *sitaning lek-ta* or *sitanreng lek-ta* may mean also, I saw him *when I was ploughing*. Hence when either of these constructions is used, the context and the circumstances must be attended to.

If instead of *re* the Postposition *lo* be suffixed to the Participle, it is understood that the Participle is an Adverbial Clause modifying the Subject and not the Object. *Sitanloing lek-ta*,—I saw *him whilst I was ploughing*.

3rd.—Instead of the constructions described under 1st and 2nd, the Mundas very frequently form a Compound Predicate in which *lel* stands first, and the word denoting the action which is seen stands second. *Lel-siked'-koang*,—I saw them ploughing. *Lel-nirjad'-koang*,—I see them running away. *Lel-olked'-meang*,—I saw thee writing.

In these Compounds the ambiguity mentioned in 1st and 2nd does not exist. But whenever the second part of the Compound is a Transitive word, there arises an ambiguity of a different kind. The Transitive word may have a Passive meaning, but it can never take a Passive Affix, because the Voice of the Compound as such is determined by lel which is necessarily Active in the Compound. Thus lel-tam-ked'koing may mean either I saw them *whilst they were beating* one or more others, or I saw them *being beaten*. Here, again, context and circumstances must decide.

Aium.—1st.—It may take a bare Participle preceding the Pronominal Subject, *v. gr.*, Jagartan-ing aiumkia,—I heard him speaking.

2nd.—Instead of a Participle it may take the Infinitive or bare root, *v. gr.*, Jagar-ing aiumkia,—I heard him speaking; Durang-bu aiumkoa ! Let us hear them singing.

3rd.—Sometimes it forms a Compound with another Predicate. If so, it stands second. This construction seems to differ from the above only by the transposition of the Pronominal Subject—

Jagaraiumkiaing,—I heard him speak; Durangaiumkiaing,—I heard him sing.

At'kar, which is generally constructed impersonally, does not concur with other Predicates to form Compounds. The Participle depending on it takes the affix leka, *like, as though, as if*. I felt a snake pass over me,—Bing leng paromjangleka at'karkina; literally, I felt *as though* a snake *were creeping across* me.

Permissives and Causatives are formed by adding any of the three following to Transitive or Intransitive Predicates: rika, iri or is'hi.

The context and the circumstances must decide whether these Compounds do in a given case denote *real causation* or a mere *permission* or a *favour*—

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Hijü-rikaked'koae ...} \\ \text{Hijü-iriked'koae ...} \\ \text{Hijü-ichiked'koae ...} \end{array} \right\} \text{ may mean } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{either He caused them to come,} \\ \text{he made them come, or} \\ \text{he allowed them to come.} \end{array} \right.$$

Iri and ichi are used only as Causative or Permissive affixes.

Rika is used also as an independent Predicate, meaning *to do*. Chilekateko rikakeda ? is equivalent to *chilekakedako* ? How have they done it ?

Idiomatically rika is also used to denote a *sound thrashing*. Khub'ko rikakia,—They gave him a *sound thrashing*.

Ruar or rua means *to return*. Added to other Predicates, it performs the function of the Latin and English Prefix *re*.

Ol, *to write*; hence ol-ruar, *to rewrite*. Om-ruar, *reddere*, *to return*, *to give back*. Bai-ruar, *reficere*, *to repair*.

Eté means *to begin*. Added to other Predicates, it yields *Inceptives*.

Ol-eté, *to commence writing*. Inung-eté, *to begin to play*.

Hoka means *to cease, to stop*. Added to other Predicates, it implies that the action denoted by them ceases.

Ol-hoka, *to cease writing*. Inung-hoka, *to stop playing*.

Chaba means *to complete, to finish*. Added to other Predicates it yields *Completive Compounds*. These differ from the Compounds with hoka, inasmuch as they imply the *real completion* of a work or action, whereas those with hoka denote a *mere cessation* of a work or action which does not necessarily imply completion.

Ol-chabakedae,—He finished the whole piece of writing which he had undertaken. Jomchabakedae may mean he has finished his meal, *i.e.*, he has eaten as much as he wanted, or, he has eaten everything that was set before him.

The following occur only as Affixes in compound words: bara, tab or ba. They perform the function of Adverbs, but they are no longer used as independent Adverbs. Bara means *about, here and there, now and then*.

Sen-bara, to walk or go *about*. Bu-bara, to pierce or make holes *here and there* in something. Chuk-bara, to make a mistake *now and then*.

Tab or ba means *quickly, fast*. Hijutab, to come *quick*. Nir-tab, to run *fast*. Ol-tab, to write *fast*.

Tuka is used only as an affix, and has the same meaning as the Hindi *rakhna* in the expression *bolrakho*.

It implies that an action already begun is to be interrupted for the purpose of doing that which is denoted by the word to which tuka is prefixed. It may also imply the momentary leaving of a place for the purpose of doing the act denoted by the word to which tuka is suffixed.

Kaji-tukaine! Tell him (this or that) first (*and then continue your present work, or, and then return*). Ne horoko lel-tukakom! See these men safely out (or in) (*and then continue your present work or and then return*).

Adverbs are by preference suffixed to their Predicates so as to form a Compound. In these Compounds the Adverbial Affixes te, leka or lekate are never used with the Adverbs.

Bes, *well*. Hence Kaing lel-besked'koa,—I did not see them well. Marang, long ago, in the beginning. Aége eser-maranglâe,—He was the first to take possession. Bai-poktaakadae,—He has made it solidly.

When Adverbs are separated from their Predicates they generally take the Affixes te, leka or lekate re, ete or ate. Beslekate kaing jelked'koa. Marangree eserlâ. Poktatee baiakada.

SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

Since in Mundari the Syntax or description of the Proposition as such coincides with the Etymology of the language, a special syntactical part would amount only to a repetition of what has already been explained in the Introduction and through the various chapters on Etymology.

Nevertheless, because the rendering of English subordinate clauses presents such considerable difficulties, I here subjoin a summary recapitulation on this subject with a number of examples which I give word for word as I noted them occasionally from the lips of Mundas who are ignorant of Hindi. To these I add a number of similary collected examples in which words are transferred from their primary functions, or that which we are inclined to consider as their primary functions, to the function of Transitive or Intransitive Predicates. These examples must not be looked upon as exceptional and rare idiomaticisms which the average Munda would but seldom use. On the contrary, the less a Munda knows of Hindi, the more he is given to this characteristic transfer of function.

I.—Relative Clauses.

The Substantive and Adjective functions of Tense-forms have been fully explained in preceding pages. (See Introduction from pages xxv to xxxi and pages lv and lvi and Grammar, pages 120 and 121.)

Marheu! sidalenko hijupe! He! those who came in first, come here!
Samrom namken gomkeko ne bangaloreko taikena,—The Europeans who were looking for gold lived in this bungalow.

Ne Nanedo med banlekat senbaratanae,—That Nane walks about like one who has no eyes.

—Ale paraunkentea kitabing namtana,—I want the book in which we were reading, i.e., which served as our reader. (Note how in this the Participle parauken is turned into an Instrumental Noun, although it qualifies the word kitab.)

Ka dulakaná duleben,—Water those (plants) which have not been watered. (Note how the word dul, which means to pour anything, is used here in the sense of to water owing to the context. The sentence was used by a gardener directing two boys whilst watering the garden.)
Patraakana enako gutuea,—They use the word gutu to designate a place which is covered with shrubs.

Netäre miad ka-urungjan diyaselaing namlá,—Here I found a match which has not yet been fired. (Urungó, to come out, is used of matches like the English to go off is used of explosives.)

Ranchitenko auriko ruara,—Those who go to Ranchi (i.e., those who are in charge of this law-suit, and who consequently have to go to Ranchi for each hearing of the case) are not yet back.

Hen merom kale makia honder goéai horo kaetaikena mente,—We did not cut (i.e., kill) that goat the other day because the man for whom we were to kill it was not there (at our place), i.e., because the guest, in whose honour we were going to kill it, did not turn up. (Here we have the Future Tense with an Indirect Pronominal Object: goé-ai.)

En orá ondorled'leka nádo leloá,—Now that house looks as if some one had recently burnt it down (put fire to it).

Kula huaktiá maiomre tupuakad lijá kako tusingi, mendo pagrireko toimodea karedo maiangköréko doea dhotiló oró dhoti banónido botoére,—They (the Mundas) do not wear around their neck a cloth which they have dipped into the blood of a man whom a tiger has killed (literally, bitten), but they tie it up together with their turban or they put it somewhere about their waist in their dhoti, and he who has no dhoti (puts it) into his botoé (a very narrow waist cloth). This sentence was given in an explanation of the various charms Mundas wear against tigers, snakes, and sickness.

The two preceding examples illustrate the Munda's preference for the use of *Active Past Participles* in cases where we would rather use *Participles of the Passive Voice*.

Participial Nouns may without any other affix perform the function of a Circumstantial Clause of Manner—

Sarwadare Sant Petrus chabi sabakadi menáia neredo judalekæ chapakana,—In Sarwada Saint Peter is represented with the keys in his hands, but here he is pictured differently; literally, In Sarwada there is St. Peter, one who keeps in his hands (Continuative Present) the keys.

Indefinite Pronouns are sometimes used in correlation with Definite Demonstratives, and thus perform the function of Relative Pronouns (page 32). In reality, however, the sentence thus obtained consists of two *Co-ordinate Propositions*. The construction is comparatively rare in districts where Hindi is unknown

Oko kaji kaji sanajäia ena kae puchid'besdaria,—Some words which he desires to say he cannot pronounce well. (He desires to pronounce some words, those he cannot, etc.)

Okoe chetanre med'ea inti pojo med'le kajia, okoe bitterre medea inti undumed',—Some one is in the habit of opening his eyes wide (of eyeing above) him we nickname *pojo med'*; some one is in the habit of keeping his eyes half-closed (eyeing inside) he is (*nicknamed*) an *undu med'*, i.e., those who make big eyes are nicknamed, etc.

Okoe balbajadi racharee gitia, okoe rabangjadi biterre gitiae,—Those who perspire sleep outside in front of the house, and those who feel cold sleep inside. *Literally*, Some one there is who perspires (or a perspirer) he sleeps outside, some one there is who feels cold, he sleeps inside. *Babbaljadia*,—he feels perspiring. Hence *balbajadi*,—one who, etc. *Rabangjadia*,—he feels cold. Hence *rabangjadi*,—one who feels cold.

Lekani lekanking, lekanko suffixed to Nouns must sometimes be translated by an English Relative Clause, the Predicate of which has to be gathered from the circumstances of the case.

Pakul'kanko auriko satchabacá,—Those who are of the size of *Paku* are not yet all caught. *Deosailekanko haltabeako*,—Those who are as rich as *Deosai* will pay quickly.

English sentences containing a Relative Clause are often cut up into a question and an answer, thus yielding two Simple Principal Propositions.

Hensäre api horo dasiko kamitanako chika? Mid' horo rdauime!—Go and call one of the three servants who work over there. (Are there three servants working over there or not? Go and call one of them hither.)

II.—Conditional Sentences.

A conditional sentence is one which states a contingency or fact as depending on a given condition. In Organic languages it is always a compound sentence. The principal proposition is that which states the fact. The dependent proposition is that which states the condition. It is called the Conditional Clause, *v.gr.*, *If he come* (Conditional Clause) *I will leave* (Principal proposition). The condition may be expressed either as *realizable* or as *unrealizable*. A realizable condition, again, may be expressed as *probable* or as *improbable*. In Organic languages

these differences attaching to the manner in which the condition is expressed cause changes in the Tense and Mood of the Verbs of both the Conditional and the principal proposition.

In the sentence *If he come I will leave*, the condition appears as both *realizable* and *probable* or at least as *apprehended*.

A change of Tense in the Conditional and of Mood in the Principal Proposition will make a realizable condition appear as improbable or not apprehended, *v.gr.*, *If he came I would go*.

Unrealizable conditions always demand a similar change of Tense and Mood.

In Mundari the Conditional Sentence is really a simple proposition, inasmuch as it contains but one Subject and one Predicate. The whole Mundari Conditional Clause is reduced to an Adverbial Compound.

A further difference between Organic and Mundari conditional sentences lies in the fact that neither the nature of the condition nor the manner in which it is expressed ever cause any change of Tense or Mood.

Condition is expressed by the Postposition *re*, *in*.

The following may be accepted as a safe, though purely mechanical, method to form Conditional Clauses. The substitution of *re* for the Copula *a* transforms any Mundari Tense-form into a correct Conditional Clause.

Sen-a-ing,— I will go. *Sen-re-ng*, if I go. *Kaing sen-a*,— I won't go. *Kaing sen-re*,— If I do not go. *Raleko-a-ing*,— I shall first call them. *Raleko-re-ng*,— If I were first to call them. *Raked'ko-a-m*,— Thou didst call them. *Raked'ko-re-m*,— If thou hadst called them. *Daló-a-ko*,—They will be beaten. *Daló-re-ko*,—If they be beaten. *Dapaljan-a-king*, They had a fight (were beating each other). *Dapaljan-re-king*,—If they had been beating each other. *Dasin-a-ko*,—They will engage themselves as servants. *Dasin-re-ko*,—If they engage as servants.

In these Conditional forms the Pronominal Affixes *ing* (*ng*), *m*, *e*, *lang*, *ling*, etc., etc., must, I think, be considered as *Possessive Affixes*, just as in the expressions *apu-ing*, *enga-m*.

The Tense-form together with its Pronominal Objects becomes a Noun by the fact of its being no longer referred to a Subject by means of the Copula *a* (see Introduction, pages xxvii, xxviii, xxix). *Sen*,— the act or the case of going. *Raleko*,—the act or the case of first calling them. *Raked'ko*,—the act or the case of having called them. In the Locativ

Case in *re* these compounds may be rendered thus: *Sen-re*,— in the case of...going. *Ráleko-re*,—in the case of...calling them first. If to this the Possessive Affixes *ing*, *m*, *e*, etc., be added, we get: *Senre-ng*,— in my going, or, in the case of my going. *Ralekore-m*,—In thy calling them, or, in the case of thy calling them.

The Conditional Clause may follow the Principal Proposition; but as a general rule it precedes it.

The Principal Proposition stands in that Tense of the Indicative Mood which it would stand in if it were absolute, *i.e.*, independent of any condition.

Ranchite senreng naua lijáing auamea,— If I go to Ranchi, I will bring a new cloth for thee.

The word *honang* or *honanga* placed after the Conditional form implies that the condition is either unrealizable or at least that it is considered as one which will certainly or probably not be realized, though it might possibly be fulfilled.

Ranchite senreng honang lijáing auamea,—If I were to go to Ranchi (which, under the circumstances, I cannot or will not do), I would bring a cloth for thee.

Honang may also be placed after the Principal proposition—

Ranchite senreng lijáing auamea honanga.

Rálekorem honang kachiko hijua? If thou wert first to call them would'nt they come? or *Rálekorem kachiko hijua honang. Gara paromdarijanre Ranchiteng senkena honang*,—I would have gone to Ranchi if it had been possible to cross the river.

If it be desired to imply that the event spoken of in the Principal proposition would *certainly* take place if the condition were fulfilled, then *honang* must be placed after the Conditional Clause and *derang* or *chimad'* are placed after the Principal Clause. *Derang* and *chimad'* are not used after Predicates in the Past Tense. *Ranchite senreng honang lijáing auamea derang*,—I would certainly bring a cloth for thee if I went (could go) to Ranchi.

Rálekorem honanga hijúako derang,—If you were to call them, they would certainly come.

Conditional Clauses which in English are introduced by *but* or *even* suffix *do* or *o* respectively to *re*, v. gr.—

But if you had called them, they would have come,—*Ráked'kore-do-m hijúlenako honang*.

If in Past Tense propositions it be desired to state that the event would *certainly* have taken place had the condition been fulfilled, then the Adverb *sartige* or *sartige dang* is used instead of *derang*. This Adverb precedes the Predicate, whereas *honang* follows it. *Ráked'kore-do-m sartigedangko hijúlena hongang*,—But if thou hadst called them, they would most certainly have come.

Ráked'kore-o-m kako hijúlena hongang,—*Even* if thou hadst called them, they would not have come.

The ordinary construction of the Principal proposition may be replaced by the following idiomatic construction :

The Instrumental Suffix *ted* is substituted for the Copula after the Predicate of the Principal Clause, and the Pronominal Subject is affixed to the word immediately preceding the Predicate—

Ráked'korem sartige ko hijújan-ted hongang, for *hijújana hongang*.

Taka taekenre hongang en hatuing auked'ted for *aukeda*,—If I had had money (*literally*, if there had been money), I would have taken (*i.e.*, bought) that village. *Sadom kae taekenre kae sendarited hongang*,—If he had had no horse, he would probably be unable to go. *Sadom bangdire hongang kae sendarited derang or chimad'*,—If he had no horse, he would certainly be unable to go.

The only explanation I can offer of the construction in *ted* is this: It may be considered as an elliptical impersonal proposition, in which the Predicates *there is*, *there would be*, *there would have been* a means are understood.

Thus *Taka taekenre en hatuing auked'ted ... hongang*,—Had I had money, *there would have been* wherewithal to buy that village or

wherewith I might have bought that village, = *Taka taekenre en hatuing aukented taekena honang*.

Sadom bangaire kas sendarited honang = *ae sendarited ka taekena honang*,—If he had no horse, there would be *no means* of his going or *no means* whereby he could go.

In all the above constructions the use of the Simple or the Emphatic Personal Pronominal Subjects follows the rules given above (pages 12 and 13).

When the Subject of the Conditional Clause is the same as that of the Principal proposition, it need not be expressed twice—

If I go, I will give it to you,—*Senre-ng omamea*. In this case the Affix *ng* after *senre* must of course be considered as Subject to *omamea* and no longer as Possessive Affix to *senre*.

Isolated Conditional Clauses are frequently used in conversation to replace a negative reply. These replies are generally followed by *chi* or *oro* or *chi oro*. They contain the reason of the expected negative reply. The same construction is often used sarcastically.

Didst thou bring a cloth for me? *Lijam auaiñachi*? Instead of simply replying *no*, *I didn't*, the Munda will very frequently assign the condition on which the bringing of a new cloth depends, *v.gr.*, If I had money! *Paisa menäre chi*! or *paisa menärechi oro*! or If I had gone to the market,—*Pitteng senkenrechi*!

Have you sown that field? *En pirim herakada*? Not yet? *Silerechi*! Here even the Pronominal Affix is wanting, If I had first ploughed it (then I might have sown it). A free but correct translation of the idea implied is this: Sowed that field! Why that presupposes ploughing, a thing I have yet to do. The Principal Clause is often added to these replies.

Lijam auaiñachi? *Paisa menäreching auamea honang*! If I had money, I might bring a cloth for thee. *En pirim herakedachi*? *Silerechi heroä honanga*! If I first plough it, then there will be means of sowing.

The Conditional Clause form is also used to make a polite suggestion, *v.gr.*, *Inta pantisoje dolekórebu honang*,—Suppose we were to arrange the bricks side by side in a straight line.

III.—Circumstantial Clauses of Time.

1. *Re* is used to express in a more or less loose manner the concomitance of a secondary event with that which is spoken of in the principal proposition. Hence in this function *re* is translated by *when*, *at the time of*. Circumstantial Clauses of Time are therefore obtained by detaching the Copula *a* from any Mundari Transitive or Intransitive Predicate and affixing *re* instead of the Copula.

Upudub'tan-re enlekádole kájia,—We say so (we use the word *chundul*) *when* we are actually pointing out one another.

Hásu-reko patia, They will believe this (a warning to abstain from bad meat) *when they shall get sick*;

Aing itukire khube monelá ; nádoe landinjana,—He applied himself seriously (to study) *at the time when I was teaching him*; but now he has become lazy;

Uiúilen-reng gculena,—I 'got wounded *when I had fallen down* or rather *when I had first fallen*. (Note the Anterior Past form which is used to show that the act of falling immediately preceded the wound, and is therefore considered as the cause.) *Uriko bankuátako-re uriko mendako-táreko siea*,—*When they* (the Mundas) *have no oxen* (of their own) then they plough with those who have cattle.

To a question concerning the meaning of the word *tagoe* the following reply was given: *Mochate 'jomjan-re enako tágoea*,—*When* (something) *has been eaten by or with the mouth* that they call *tagoe*, i.e., *to masticate*.

Hansárem taeken-redoing kajijad taekena,—But I was relating it whilst you were over there.

2. *Ló* and *inta* or *intang* are used instead of *re* to denote concomitance or simultaneity in the strict sense of the term. They must therefore be rendered by *at the moment*, *at the very time*, *just as*, etc. *Gomke hiju-lóge ghanta saripe!* Ring the bell as soon as the master comes.

Am kam tebaled-imtange nirjana,—He ran away just a little before you arrived.

Te suffixed to any Predicate implies that the act or state signified by it precedes the fact or state spoken of in the principal proposition.

Misa giti-te angpharchiaing,—When or after (I) lie down, I sleep in one stretch till day-break. (N.B.—Here *giti* is in the Indeterminate Tense because it denotes a habit or natural disposition.)

Mara! dá han darure dulepe abungkó-te,—He you! pour water on (i.e., around) yonder tree, after you have first washed yourself. (*Abungkó* is the Anterior Future Tense-form.)

To a complaint about the difficulties of the Mundari language the following reply was given: Api-chandúko-tedo huring huringem bujauea,—But after three months will first have passed thou wilt understand a little. (Here the phrase *api chandú*, three months, is used as an Intransitive Predicate and stands in the Anterior Future Tense.)

Chi is suffixed to *Past Tense-forms* to denote priority.

Enad'do apuing miad sadom iikó-chi oráte aururaliña,—Then my father having taken a pony to that place brought me back home. Jomked'chiko joarkia ad'ko senójana,—Having eaten they greeted him and went away.

Ate suffixed to a Tense-form implies that the state spoken of in the principal clause has continued *uninterruptedly* ever since the event signified by the Tense-form took place. These Temporal clauses are often preceded by mod' or mid' used adverbially and meaning *in one stretch*—

Mod' hijúlen-ate misao kae nirlena,—From the moment he came up to the present, he did not run away. Ne orá mid' baiakan-ate jetatäre ka bagrauakana,—This house has never got spoiled anywhere ever since it has been built (made). Am hijúakan-ate kako siea etwar hulang,—Ever since you have come here they do no more plough on Sundays.

Red or rá may be suffixed to a Tense-form to denote a loose simultaneity. Temporal Clauses of this kind are so characteristically idiomatic that they defy any literal translation.

Neado apuing mendi-rá kajige,—This happened at the time when my father was still alive. (*Kaji*, a word, is often used as an equivalent of the English *an occurrence, an affair*. Here the Principal Clause is elliptical: *Neado kajige* for *neado kaji taná*,—This is an occurrence. The Genitive of Time *apuing mendirá* depends on *kaji*. We might say an occurrence of my father's time. But we could never use a Present Tense-form even in the circumlocution: This is an occurrence! of the time when my father was still alive). *Neado sidared, baiar sid'jan-rá*,—This happened before that, namely, on the occasion when the rope snapped.

IV.—Causal Clauses.

Te may be suffixed to Tense-forms to denote *cause* and thus transform them into Causal Clauses.

(*Buri*) *holo boloken-te chi oró ná kae taina!* Won't (the bear) be there now (in the den) since he entered yesterday! i.e., the bear is sure to remain in the den still now because he entered it yesterday.

Inungo ka rasika tarako kakoatan-te,—There is no pleasure in playing since or because some (boys) refuse (to play).

Pusio bangáire pusi! pusi! chikanamentem koklatana? Minaun minaun ae menea-te,—What art thou shouting for a cat! a cat! when there is no cat (about this house) at all? Because he (the cat) says *miau miau!*

Sonsorod'ko baba jomchabajadakotaiñá auri auri auritege,—The grasshoppers are eating up my whole crop of paddy because of my long delays to reap it. (*Auri* means *not yet*. Here it is used intransitively, and therefore means *to delay, i.e., to be always saying not yet! not yet not yet!* That the delay refers to the reaping must be gathered from the context.)

Riringkedale isudinjan-te,—We forgot it because it happened long ago (because many days have passed). (Here *isudin*, many days, is used intransitively.)

Sentences containing Causal Clauses are often cut up into two co-ordinate Propositions.

Isu dinjana; enatele riringkeda,—Many days have passed since: on account of that we forgot it.

Tarako kakoatana ; ena-te inungo ka rasika,—A certain number of boys refuse (to play) : on account of that there is no pleasure even in playing.

Mente. This is the Causative form of *men*, to say (see pp. 61 and 175). This *men* is not confined to the denotation of audible speech. It is often used to signify an interior speaking to one's self, and thus it becomes equivalent to the English *To believe, to think, to suppose, to be under the impression*. Hence when it is suffixed to Tense-forms for the purpose of denoting *cause*, it does by its very nature denote *a subjective cause, a reason*, the perception of which impels a living agent. Accordingly the Clause preceding *mente* is treated as a Direct-speech form, *v.gr.*, He punished *me* because *I* came late, becomes in Mundari, *Saying "thou camest late,"* he punished me,—*Bilamjanam mentee sajaikiña*.

However, *mente* as Causal Affix is no longer restricted to this its original meaning. It is now often treated as a mere Causal Affix in which the signification of *men, to say*, is obliterated. Hence *mente* may, like *te*, be used to denote *cause in general* and be construed also in the same way—

Bilamjana-ing mentee sajaikiña,—He punished me *because* I came late. *Ote keteakana mente chálu ka itua*,—It is impossible to hoe *because* the ground is hard.

Causal Clauses are also formed by means of the Affix *rá*. These, like the Temporal Clauses in *red* or *rá*, are characteristically idiomatic—

Ne upun paisa, botol ka perejan-rá, Here are four pice over *because the bottle has not been filled*. (Literally, Here the four pice of the not having been filled up bottle, *i.e.*, the four pice due back to you for that amount (of oil) which is wanting towards the filling of the bottle.)

To signify that a certain effect is not obtained notwithstanding the existence of a cause which was thought sufficient to produce that effect, the Affix *o, even*, is added to a Causal Clause in *te*.

Hela ! am upuniamedakan-te-o kam lejídiam,—Hallo ! thou doest not see him (the bird), although thou beest four-eyed. (This was said to me by an old Munda who had tried in vain to point out a bird to me

in the foliage of a tree. *Upunia med'*, four eyes, is used here in the Perfect of the Passive Voice, and is intended to denote spectacles which, added to the natural eyes, make up the four eyes spoken of by the old man.)

Gonoé kabu nirdaria rajaakan-te-o-ka,—None of us can escape death, not even though we be kings.

Rokage niridiled'te-o kae tebakia,—He did not reach him (find him alive any more), although he ran thither at once.

When the principal proposition is affirmative, this construction implies that a certain effect is produced notwithstanding the existence of a cause which was thought sufficient to prevent that effect—

Jetana ka gunaked'te-o-le saiaijana,—We were punished, although we had committed no fault whatever.

The Affix *o* is sometimes omitted, especially in sarcastic apostrophies—

He! am! seranakan-te-m kam daria! What! thou! being such a smart chap, thou canst not do it!

V.—Final Clauses.

1st—They may be obtained by suffixing *mente* to the Optative Mood-forms. Here it is necessary to keep in mind what has been said concerning the rendering of the English Indirect-speech forms into Mundari (see Introduction, pages lvi and lvii).

With these Clauses *mente* really denotes a desire. Taken in connection with the Optative form, it literally means, *because I say (to myself), because thou sayest (to thyself), etc., let this or that be done*. But this implies a desire.

Nirkae mente janaue erangjaita,—He is always scolding me in order that *I* should run away; *literally*, Because he says (to himself): “Let *him* run away!” he is always scolding me.

Horare alokako boroa mente banduke omad'lea; *literally*, Because he says (to himself): “Let *them* not fear on the way” he gave us

a gun. Hence, freely : He gave us a gun in order that *we* might not fear on the way.

Mundaókaiing mente khube rikantana ; literally, Because he says (to himself) : " Let me become village-chief ! " he bestirs himself a great deal. Hence, freely, He bestirs himself a great deal in order to become village-chief (in order that he should become village-chief).

2nd.—The Optative without *mente* may be used to denote purpose. The result is a Compound Sentence in which two propositions are co-ordinated without any link-word *ad hoc*—

Auldíng nellekæ, —I brought in order that he might see it ; literally, I brought, let him see it.

3rd.—The Instrumental Suffix *te* added to Tense-forms yields sometimes Compounds which are best rendered into English by a Final clause.

A boy asking another, who was digging a trench, what he was up to received the following reply : *Am tōpa-te gara, —(I am digging) a grave to bury thee.*

4th.—The Substantive Instrumental Affix *tea* is used similarly : *Miad' jo idikóaiing Thomastá rasikantedá gomke omlde mente ? May I take one fruit to Thomas wherewith or whereat he may rejoice himself because the master has given it, literally, May I take one fruit to Thomas, a wherewithal to rejoice himself, because he will say the master gave it. Chikanaben namtana ? What do you two want ? Tin-hon dáling dūl-teá, —A small tin in order that we (he and I) may pour water (on the flower pots) ; literally, a wherewith to pour water we two.*

5th.—*Leka*, like, yields strongly idiomatic Final clauses—

Guri suid' besepe hasaló midó-leka, —Knead the cow manure properly in order that it may mix perfectly with the earth ; literally, to become like one thing with the earth ; or knead the cowdung like becoming one thing with the earth.

Ne ari ghari hardaríó-leka chakareabu —Let us broaden this dam, so that a cart may be driven over it ; literally, let us broaden this dam like a cart being able to be driven.

VI.—Subordinate Clauses of Manner introduced by “as though,” “as if.”

They are rendered into Mundari by affixing *leka* to any Tense-form. These clauses are sometimes strongly elliptic, much having to be gathered from the context and the circumstances for their complete understanding.

Sojege oltana roltad'-leka,—He writes quite straight *as though* he had ruled (his paper). *Ro* is the Mundarized English Verb *to rule*. Hence *roltadae*, he has ruled (his paper).

En piala sab'ted banolekam sabakada,—Thou art holding that cup *as if* it had no handle.

Iskulhonko nindirko jonki-lekako latabia,—The schoolboys will cut his hair (so as to make him look) *as though* the white-ants had eaten him (his hair).

Julab botolre nutab'-leka leloa mendo itilitila,—Castor oil when in a bottle looks *as though* it could be drunk fast (i.e., it looks as fluid as water), but it is very fatty.

When Clauses with the Affix *leka* modify the words *tor*, *at'kar*, *biswas*, *boro* they express a belief, an impression or an apprehension, and therefore are equivalent to English clauses introduced by *that*, *lest*, or Clauses standing as Direct Objects without any introductory word —

En kaji olakam-lekaing torkeda,—I am under the impression *that that* word has been written down.

Batire sered' ban'-lekaing torkeda,—I believe *there is no* wick in the lamp.

Chaprasi padaing-lekaing borojada,—I fear *the chaprassi is going to* kick me; literally, I apprehend the chaprassi *as being about to* kick me.

VII.—Restrictive Clauses.

Restrictive or limitative clauses which in English are introduced by *as for*, *as far as* *is concerned*, *with regard to*, etc., are in Mundari rendered in two ways:

1st.—The bare root-form of the Predicate generally with, sometimes without the Affix *do* is placed either before or after the complete Predicate, i.e., the Predicate with its formative affixes—

Kako tigakeda tigado, *as for* *trampling on it*, that they have not done.

Aledo kale longatana bōnga, as far as devil-worship is concerned, we do not worship devils.

Nirido kale nira, as for running away, that we won't do.

2nd.—The repeated Predicate root is made to depend on the word *kaji* and therefore takes the Suffix *rá*. In these expressions *kaji* means a matter, an affair, and it generally takes the Affix *do*. *Tebaeako tising teba-rá kajido*,—They will reach to-day so far as the mere matter of reaching is concerned.

VIII.—Correlative Clauses of Manner.

Since there are no distinct Correlative forms in Mundari, our Correlative Clauses of Manner are rendered by simply suffixing *leka* or *lekate* to Tense-forms. The correlation must be guessed from the context. These clauses are sometimes strongly elliptic.

Merom ating-lekae olre sekeraea,—He writes as fast as a goat grazes ; literally, When writing he hastens as much as (the mouth of) a grazing goat.

Gerki-lekae latab'jana,—He is shorn as unevenly as if rats had nibbled off his hair ; literally, He is shorn as if rats had nibbled or gnawed him.

Ka sunumakan-lekae lelba,—He looks as untidy as one who has no rubbed oil on his hair and body. (*Sunumen*, to oil one's self).

Nea ale honder lumamko aukented-lekana (koto),—This is a branch of the same kind as the one on which we brought the silk-worms the other day.

IX.—Correlative Clauses of Place.

Soma daru má-tá mendia,—Soma is there where they cut the tree. *Tuingh-tá sakidakan maiom mendakanagea*,—There is still now coagulated blood there where they shot him with an arrow.

Enad'do bintiked'chi sobenko mod'rele jojoma, oró ka-bijankido asá titege oró jomae, ad' bijankodo apan jomkenteá chipi gasarkeate apan jomken taead'rege dubhapeakanko taena etáko auri jomchabajaked,—Then after saying the prayers we would all eat together, and if any one had not enough (literally, and the not satiated one), he would of his own accord take and eat more, and those who had their fill, having cleaned the vessel from which they had eaten, would sit still in the place in which they had eaten until the others would finish eating.

EXAMPLES SHOWING THE TRANSFER OF WORDS FROM THEIR ORIGINAL FUNCTIONS TO THAT OF TRANSITIVE OR INTRANSITIVE PREDICATES.

Dura, dust. Duraótanaing,—I am getting covered with dust.

Sirma, roof; chandae, eaves of a roof. Enado kale sirmaá chandaeale,—We don't call that roof; we call it eaves.

Ang, name of a Hindi letter. Ne aksar okoate Angótana? By what (additional sign) does this letter (the Hindi *a*) become *Ang*?

Hasa, earth. Enare oróle hasaea? Shall we throw more earth into that?

Bir, forest. En hora bejai birakana,—That road leads through dense forest. (Note that *biró* does not here mean *to be covered with forest*, as it would, *v. gr.*, in the sentence *En disum birakana*.) The present meaning, *to lead through a forest*, must be gathered from the nature of the Subject, *hora*, a road, which of course cannot be covered with forest.

Lacho, lip. Atiri-kandomlekam lachoakana! Thou hast got lips like the rim of a chatu-cover.

Dar, the edge of a knife or sword. Mid'sá darakana chi baransá? Is it single-edged or double-edged?

Badnam, bad reputation. Aiñae badnamtana! He gives me a bad reputation. (Note the Affix *á* to *aing*, *cfr.* Postpos., pages 42, 43, 44 and 45.)

Nilidá, honey (literally, bee-water). Niliko kako dákedá,—The bees have not made honey. (Note how the word *nilidá'* is truncated because the first part of the compound occurs as Subject of the sentence—

Gitiorá,—The village dormitory for young people. In most villages all the boys and unmarried young men sleep, not in their respective houses, but altogether in a separate house, or if there be that commodity, in the dancing-house, called *akra*. The girls sleep in another house under the guardianship of some old woman, generally a widow. These dormitories are called *gitiorá*. *Gitiorádo kale gitiorótana*,—As for the public dormitories, we do not sleep there.

Bó, head. Nesám bóea chi hansá? Shall I put your pillow this side or that side? Literally, Will thou put thy head this side or that side?—*Setahonking misáreking bóakana niralge!* The two pups are so nicely sleeping head against head!

Dá, water. *Dáakana neredo*,—Here (it is watered) there is too much water. (This was used by one of the coolies who was beating concrete in the foundations, and it was intended to convey the idea that there was too much water in a particular part of the lime and stone mixture.)

Turam, bifurcation, v.gr., the point at which a branch starts from the trunk. *Nesáte miad' horaakana hansáteo miad' horaakana enaoko tūrama*,—When one road leads this way and another road leads that way, that too they call *turam*, bifurcation, *i.e.*, They also use the word *turam* (bifurcation) to denote the branching off of a road in two different directions. (Note the use of the absolute or categorical forms *horakana* instead of the conditional forms, *Nesáte miad' horaakanre*, etc.)

Orá, house (in the Reflexive Voice). *Aéá kurio oránjanae*,—His wife too left him, *i.e.*, has gone back to her parents' house.

Konea, bride. *Entedo en kuri oroe koneanjanæ*,—Then that woman (a widow) married again, *i.e.*, again made a bride of herself.

Kanda or *kandæ*, a compartment, a room, a separate place in a house, etc. *Jimбири kandaægea* or *kandaakana*,—The *jimбири*, *i.e.*, a peculiarly constructed fish-trap, has several compartments.

Kuri, wife. *Bariaæ huriked'kinga*,—He took two wives.

Jomti, right hand (literally, the eating hand). *Buruma hatulang paromeachi?* *Ka gomke jomtialang*,—Shall we (thou and I) pass through the village of Buruma? No, Sir, we shall leave it to our right-hand side, *i.e.*, we shall pass on the left of Buruma.

Daru, tree. *Neredang darulena*,—It is in this place that the tree stood. (Note the Anterior Past, *darulena*,—There was a tree here formerly.)

Nida, night. *Mandiaæ nádo gomke, nidaólea karedo holaleka*,—We will cook now, Sir, otherwise the night will again overtake us like yesterday. [*Literally*, It will become night (for) us.] Here the Noun *nida* is first used in the Passive Voice; then this Passive form is retransferred to the Active function, and thus it takes the Inserted Pronominal Direct Object *le*.

The more ordinary construction with such words as *nida*, *aiub'*, etc., consists in using them simply as Passive forms with the Personal Pronouns as Subject. *Nidaóale*; literally, we shall be nighted, *i.e.*, we shall be overtaken by the night. *Entedoko aiub'jana*,—And then they were delayed till evening.

Dokan, a shop. Nado chikanae kamitana? Chungi gomkee dokanakada,—
What is he doing now? He is selling cigars; *literally*, he has made a
cigar shop.

*Taka, rupee. Baha akiringóre takaoá,—*If one can afford to sell
paddy, then one can make money. (*Literally*, If paddy be sold, rupees
will become.)

*Uri, bullock. Mahae uriked'koa,—*He acquired bullocks last year.

Miad'em mromked'kore Dikue kumtruia, miad'em simked'kore into
*idia,—*The zamindar robs us of every goat or fowl we rear. (*Literally*,
If thou rear a goat, the zamindar steals it: if thou rear a fowl that too
he takes. (For explanation of the Plural forms *ko* as Direct Objects
after *miad'* see pages 29 and 30.)

Dá, water. Nea chikana? Dá chimad'. He mar nume daredo.
What is this? Water to be sure! All right, drink it then *if it be water*.

Daru, wood. Ne huka chikana? Daruge. Hela! darure chiamente ka
loa? What is this pipe (what's it made of)? It is wood. How that!
If it be wood, why does it not burn?

*Diku: Hindu. Oróe dikuiña,—*Then he would again address me
in Hindi (Here the Indeterminate is used because the sentence
occurred in a vivid narration). Proper Nouns when thus used to denote
a particular language are more frequently construed *intransitively*.

Am Horore horoaingme tobe! chikanam dikuaingtana! If thou
be a Munda, well, then, speak Mundari to me! What art thou address-
ing me in Hindi for?

Gomkedang Dikuiña oró! But it was the master who nicknamed
me Diku. Chikanamentee enkaked'ma? Misa misaing dikubaraea mente,—
Why did he call thee thus? Because sometimes I speak a bit of Hindi.

The way in which Patronymics are used transitively or intransi-
tively is especially puzzling—

*Tenja-ing or tenja-ng,—*My junior brother-in-law.

*Tenjangaiing,—*He is my junior brother-in-law, *i.e.*, I say to him:
my brother-in-law.

Tenjangaiam ? Is he thy junior brother-in-law, *i.e.*, Doest thou say to him : *my brother-in-law* ?

Tenjangaiæ,—He is his junior brother-in-law, *i.e.*, He says to him : *my brother-in-law*.

Tenjangameæ ? Art thou his junior brother-in-law, *i.e.*, Does he say to thee : *my junior brother-in-law*.

The Possessive Affix may be omitted. In that case the Transitive construction is preferred—

Mamu, maternal uncle. *Mamu-iñ-æ*,—I am his maternal uncle, *i.e.*, literally, he *maternal-uncles* me or, he calls me maternal uncle.

Mamu-i-aing,—He is my maternal uncle, *i.e.*, I call him maternal uncle.

Horø, man. Mimid' horore babar horoked'kingæ mentee darijana, karedo honang kage,—He would most likely not have got the victory in that fight had he not put two men against each one of their men ; *literally*, Because *against* or *for each one man* (of theirs) he (put) *two men*, he succeeded, if not probably not.

Bhanda, an earthen waterpot half the usual size, which is used only by little girls of from 8 to 10 years old to fetch water in.

Ne hon bhandadaakanæ,—This girl is about 8 or 9 years old. This stands for : *Ne hon bhandare dā audariæ*,—This child can bring water in a *bhanda*. Instead of that *bhandare dā* is turned into a compound : *bhandadā*, *bhanda-water*, *i.e.*, half a *chatu* of water. This, again, used Intransitively denotes *ability* to carry half a *chatu* of water. That ability is given as an approximative index of the age.

Satom (Adverb of Time), *after two years*. To a question about the meaning of the word *satom* I received the following reply : *Bar sirma taiom enale sātoma*,—After two years that we call *satom*, *i.e.*, *Satom* means after two years.

Honder, before yesterday. *Honder honder* may mean *some weeks ago* and also *some months ago*. *Bar apidchandū sidare enado chilekatoko kajia ? Enagekoo hōnder honderá*,—What do they say for : two months ago ? That too they express by the word *honder honder*.

Martobe ! all right then ! Come on then ! martotepea ! Do say martobe ! i.e., begin the work !

Enka, like that. *Enkaeako*,—They say, *do, think, run, stand, work, etc., etc.*, like that.

Taiom, after, at the end. *Darom taiomeme ! Place the word darom afte or behind (such another word).*

Soje, straight. Ente gomke hantátele sojea,—Then, Sir, we shall go straight that way.

Tala, the middle, half. Miad' garado talaeabu nere ! Ka baiúa en pabita daru talatana,—Let us dig one trench here in the middle (between two trenches which were already dug). It won't do that papaya tree stands in the middle. [Note how in these two sentences the word *tala* is first used Transitively : let us middle the trench, *i.e.*, dig a trench in the middle. Then it is used Intransitively : *daru talatana*, the tree middles it (between the two trenches), *i.e.*, stands in the middle. *Gande, crooked ; Enatedo hora gandeótana*, and then the road turns, (*i.e.*, becomes crooked).

Ek ! do ! tin ! One ! Two ! Three ! used as a signal to begin a race.

Ek do tineabu ! Let us agree to start at the signal *ek ! do ! tin !*

Ekdoakana ! Take care you will be too late ! *i.e.*, One ! two ! has already been shouted : hence in a moment the race begins.

Mid', one ; mid'jangeale ! We are one, *i.e.*, we are equal (in a game).

Aiar, ahead ! Enlekako aiartana ne durangre,—Like that this song continues ; literally, like that they go ahead in this song.

Okoe ? who ? Neado okoeákana ? And this whose share has it become ? To whom has this been given or adjudicated ?

Oro oro, more and more. Hence Oro oróá,—Other and still other things. (These things may denote circumstances, sentences, words, etc., etc.) *Latarte ko kajiachi ? Kájiako oro oróókóre*,—Do they say *latarte* ? They do when the occasion presents itself, *i.e.*, when they happen to use other and other sentences.

Saraoro'pe,—Pour more manure.

Auri, not yet, wait a moment. Chintangking arandia ? Aurikinga,—They will wait still ; they won't marry just now.

(Note here the Impersonal Construction used with an Adverb of Time, see pages 172, 173, and 174.)

Jomtisáte,—to the right-hand side. *Ama heu ! jomtisatem !* Thou there ! Go to the right !

Chakarno, pretty broad. Ne aribu chakarnoéa,—Let us make this ridge pretty broad.

Hani, yonder one. Hani hantejada—(The one you look for) is yonder. (Literally, yonder one he yonders.)

Pechang, a chip of wood. *Pechangoá chika?* Won't the chips fly about?

Rotod', topknot of hair (a Hindu fashion of wearing hair). *Nidoo rotod'akana*,—This one wears a topknot; *literally*, is topknotted.

Basidá, water in which is poured on boiled rice and which is left standing for a day so as to turn acid. This is the ordinary drink of Mundas. They very seldom will drink plain water—*bereldá*, raw water, as they call it. *Niral*, nice. *Basidá niralakana*,—The rice-water is just at the right stage of acidity, *i.e.*, is nicely ready.

Upun diring, four horns. *Upuniako diringakana*,—(That kind of deer) are four horned, *i.e.*, each horn has two branches.

Upuniae kataakana,—(That animal) is four legged.

(Note how the Numerals qualifying Nouns are here separated from the Nouns by means of the Pronominal Subjects *ko* and *e*. It is on account of this separation that the Numerals resume the final *a* which they drop whenever they are in immediate contact with the Noun)—

Kented', many. *Kented'jaiñako*, *kaing dariakoa*. They are too many for me, I can't get over them. (They out-number me.)

Enka, like that. *Pakudange enkaled'mea*,—Sure it's Paku who first called thee thus (who first gave thee that nickname).

Janao, always. *Hewaoá janaoredo*,—One gets accustomed to it when one does it always.

Hemar! all right. *Hemarláe mendo taiomtee nirjana*,—He agreed (to come with me) at first, but afterwards he ran away.

Hemartobe! all right then! *Hemartobediña*,—He told me all right then! He agreed to it.

Hereo kareo baiñgea,—It will do anyhow whether they agree (to the proposal) or whether they do not, *i.e.*, Their or his saying yes or no does not matter one way or the other.

Maparangmed', very big eyes. *Maparanggee med'barajada*,—He opens big eyes at it, *i.e.*, he is very much surprised.

Nida-med', *literally*, night eye, is the name given to a peculiar weakness of the eyes on account of which people thus affected can see nothing at all any more after sunset. *Nidamedótanaing*,—I can no longer see anything after sunset, *i.e.*, I am affected by that eye disease.

Apan (Hindi Possessive), his own. *Goako kaing namkoá; gota haturenkoe apanked'koa*,—I shall not get any witnesses: he has got the (people of the) whole village over to his side (*Literally*, he made them his own).

Barsá, twice. *Barsákenaing, misao kaing tólá*,—I aimed (threw, hit or shot at it) twice, but did not hit it even once.

Naua, new. *Hankue nauaakad'koa*,—He has engaged or appointed yonder ones as new hands; he has appointed new men, viz. yonder ones.

Rabang, cold. *Horoko aingsáko rabangjana*,—The men turned me the cold shoulder (*literally*, became cold towards me).

Ale, we (exclusive). *Ale aleredo jeman chile rojotoa*,—When we are amongst ourselves (*i.e.*, when no foreigners are with us) don't we bring out a lot of this stuff. (After having for a couple of hours listened to and noted down the meanings Mundas attach to their dreams and to certain omens, I asked the company whether there was anything more to be added on that subject. Then a young man gave the above reply to show there was more, but that, to find it all, they must be *en famille*, so that one may bring out what another happens to forget. *Rojoto* is used to denote a consultation.)

Mipiad', one by one; also one here, one there, a few here and there. A boy who got over the worst of an attack of chicken-pox was consoled by a visitor with the sentence: *Nádo am mipia d'akanam*,—Now thou hast (only) a few here and there (*literally*, now thou art one-here-one-there-ed).

Chi ? Interrogative Interjectional Affix. A young man who had a somewhat peculiar style of speaking being asked why he did not speak like others answered: *Chiaing oró ? mochataing enka senó*,—What am I to do? My mouth goes that way. (Other people would rather say *chikaeaing ?*)

In the following complete propositions are treated as Transitive or Intransitive Predicates:—

Baiuá, —It will do. *Kaling baiuá*,—He and I won't agree to that; *literally*, we two will not (say) it will do.

Prachare ituana, —The catechist knows it. *Pracharitanaking*,—Both of them say or maintain that the prachar knows about it (both of them say pracharituana). Note that the Pronominal Subject *e* is dropped after the word *prachar* to avoid having two Pronominal Subjects.

Banoá, —There is none. *Banoáako*,—They say that there is none. *Hokaalang ! Let us stop (thou and I).* *Aledo hokaalanga*,—But we (Mundas) would express that by saying *hokaalang*.

Sartiakana, —It is true. *Sartiakanako*,—They will believe it. (They will say, it is true.)

APPENDIX.

I.—THE ASUR LEGEND.

Sirmare infgebu Singbonga-
tana.

Aking kulburiaking kapa-
jitana.

Sida biam sida sangain ...

Sona satarangge Singbonga
dubakanae, sona taiŋri-danda.

Imtangking kapajitana ...

Pati peté petétekoa, mimiaŋ'
miu miutekoa.

Ranki gundi piuri gaiking
arjitana Singbongatá: Upal-bá
pukuri, tarai-bá bandela ñundá-
tana. Chara kaling namjada,
sing-sandom, tasad'-rurá. soben
rongotana. Chimŋi-pipiri, cha-
rai-chunguni dá kako namjada,
chara kako namjada.

Sirmare Singbongae elangtanae
aiurtana.

Sona satarangire dubakanatee
aiumtana; kisjanae.

Kacha kandajanae, tuŋta pirin-
janae: Hasur-honko magiri-
koaing.

Ente kurie kajaitana: Aloma!
eskarge kam dariakoa, sangiako
haga, sangiako boea. Inku
nidaoko sipud'tana singioko
sipud'tana. Amdom eskargeam;
mapa tupuingte kam dariakoa.
Bara bidu, tero chaiakoe metáia.
Hemarkedae.

That one (who is) in heaven we (call) Sing-
bonga.

Both husband and wife are conversing with
each other.

The first marriage, the first love (theirs was).

On a golden throne Singbonga is seated: a
golden sceptre-staff (he holds).

At that time both were conversing with each
other.

They have plenty of rice; they have plenty of
cattle.

The heifer with turned-up horns, the cow with
turned-down horns both complain to Singbonga:
the tank (with its) floating flowers, the hand
(*a kind of tank*) (with its) marsh-flowers is drying
up. We two find no food: tree and shrub, grass
and stalk all is withering. The creeping insects
and the flying birds do no longer find water; they
do no more find food.

In heaven Singbonga is scorched by the heat;
he is reached by the heat (emanating from the
Asurs' furnaces).

Seated on the golden throne, he (Singbonga)
hears (these complaints); he got angry.

He armed himself with a single-edged
sword and shielded himself with a plain shield: "I
will cut the Asurs to pieces."

Then his wife said to him: Don't! alone thou
wilt not get over them. There are multitudes
of them. (*Literally*: they are many a relation,
they are many a brother.) They work (their)
furnace-bellows by night too and they work
(their) furnace-bellows by day too. But thou
art alone; in a mutual fight with the sword and
with the bow and arrows thou canst not overcome
them. Wisdom and craft! she said to him
He agreed to that (he said: all right!).

Enate dingchua maru ente kerketa jagu kuldutam ked'kingae Hasurhonkotá.

Inking kajijada : Kajichaling autada, bakanrachaling setertada. Nidape sipud'redo singi alopea! singidope sipud'redo nida alopea! Upal-bá pukūri tarai-ba bandela anjed'tana dundátana. Ranki gundi piuri gai dá kaking namjada, chara kaking namjada menteking kajitana. Chimti-pipiri, charai-chunguni dá kako namjada, chara kako namjada. Otere tasad'-rufá, sing-sandom soben rongotana. Sirmare Singbongae elangtanæ aiurtana menteking kajitana.

En Hasurhonko kajikeda : Ale Singbongatelea, ale marang deotatelea, jetaeá kaji kale manatinga.

Alege ang marangakana, alege tar marangakana. Aleáte jetae marang bangáia. Nidaole sipud'a, singiole sipud'a menteko kajirurakingtana. Kadal-xandile kandiakana, jumbulijurile juriakana. Dunda pahalle kidub'tana, dunda, pahalle angaratana, ale jetaeá kaji kale manatinga menteko kajikeda.

Dingchua kuila durateko herkiá, kerketa bicha durateko herkiá.

"Ju senóben! okoetáreben udub'ea!"

Inking senójanaking, Singbonga-táreking udub'ja da: "Hela gomke! alingdo jatiate bejaitijana!"

Senóben abená jatitáte; sobenke mid'gepe lelóae kajijad'kinga.

Then he sent the energetic kingcrow and the watchful kerketa (*a bird who cries repeatedly during night*) as messengers to the Asurs.

Those two said : We two have brought a message; we two have reached here with a request. If you work the furnace-bellows by night, then don't (work them) by day. But if you work them by day, then don't (work them) by night! The tank with its floating flowers, the band with its marsh-flowers are drying up, are getting dry. The heifer with turned-up horns, the cow with turned down horns both do no more find water, both do no longer find food, saying the two (birds) say. The creeping insects and the flying birds do no more find water; they do no more find food. On the earth grass and blade, tree and shrub are withering. In heaven Singbonga is scorched by the heat; he is reached by the heat, saying the two (birds) say.

Those Asurs said : We are greater than Singbonga; we are above the great deities; we won't obey the orders of anybody.

We are prior to the dawn; we are prior to the sunrise. There is nobody prior to us. We will work (our) furnace-bellows by night too; we will work (our) furnace-bellows by day too, saying they replied. We are clustered together like plantains in a bunch; we are close together like clusters of fruit (*we are very numerous*). We gain to-day's food by making short ploughshares; we secure to-morrow's food by preparing short ploughshares. We will not obey the orders of anybody, saying they said.

They strew coal-dust on the kingcrow; they strew iron-ore dust on the kerketa.

"Off! begone! to whom will you complain!"

Both of them went away. They complain to Singbonga: "Alas, Master! we two (he and I) have become outcasted from our caste."

Go (back) you two each to his own caste; you will all look alike (*i.e., all kingcrows will henceforth look black and all kerketas will henceforth look grey*) he says to them.

Enteking senójana ad'king
lelked'koa, mid'geako.

Ente sonadidi rupadidi kul-
ked'kingae. Iaking Hasurhon-
koking kajiakotana: Kajichal-
ing autada, bakanra chaling
setertada: etc.

Ente kotasiteko maraked'-
kinga, ente sandasomteko
maraked'kinga.

Ju senben! okoetäre ben
udub'ea nádo menteko kajiad'-
kinga.

Ente lipi susari, kaua bandari
inkinge kulked'kinga Hasur-
honkotá. Ente inking hijúlena
oróking kajiakotana: kajichal-
ling, etc.

Ente kaua kuila-durateko
herkia, lipi bicha durateko her-
kia, etc.

Ente lang-chevre Lakan,
bochochenre Kajure kuldutam-
ked'kinga, etc.

Bocho chevre sasang-dáteko
hichirkia, lang chenre chad'lom-
ko taujilingkia, etc.

Ente Singbonga baro bidu
tero chayaked'kinga.

Ekasi piri tirasi badi dasiko-
ra mátan chalutanae. Ente enre
Singbonga kasra herkeda iniá
hormore. Ente ní gaujanae.
Gaujanchi, sona richi soridikiae
iniá.

Entee metaitana: Chi de!
aing chalulea misa. Ente en
kasraakani kajiruraitana: Aingdo
kasragaute soben kud'lam
harangite topechabaakana, am-
do nelekan pharchi horo kaing
omamea mentee kajiaia.

Then both went away, and they saw them (those
of their own kind), they are all one (*they all look
alike*).

Then he sent the golden vulture and the silvery
vulture. Those two tell the Asurs: We two have
brought a message; we two have reached here
with a request, etc., as above. (*The reply of the
Asurs too is the same as above.*)

Then they struck both of them with a hammer;
then they struck both of them with the large iron
pincer.

Off! Begone! to whom will you complain now,
saying they said to both of them. (*Their com-
plaint to Singbonga and the latter's reply is the
same as above.*)

Then he sent the worshipping lark and the
leading (the forward) crow to the Asurs. Then
both of them came and they said to them: We
two have, etc. (*same as above. The Asurs' reply
too is the same.*)

Then they threw coal-dust on the crow and
iron-ore dust on the lark, etc. (*as above*).

Then he sent Lakan the lang (a small bird with
two long feathers in tail) and Kajur, the bocho, etc.

They threw saffron-water on the bocho and
they lengthened the lang's tail by pulling at it,
etc.

Then Singbonga had recourse to wisdom and
craft (*Literally*: he twelve-knowledged and
thirteen-appeared it.)

A servant is clearing (cutting) and hoeing the
eighty-one high grounds, the eighty-three high rice-
fields. Then there Singbonga sowed itch on that
one's body. Then that one got wounds. When he
had got the wounds, he (Singbonga) flew a golden
hawk towards him (went out hunting with a golden
hawk whom he made fly towards that servant).

Then he said to him. Come now! let me try
once to hoe. Then that itch-covered one replied
to him: On account of itchwounds my whole
hoe is entirely besmeared with the liquid oozing
out of the wounds. I will not give it to thee
who art such a fair man, saying he told him.

Ente Singbonga iníge chuta-
ub're sab'kía ad'e sokoekía. Ho-
torjanae. En urte Singbonga
sonójanae. Enatee senójana
Hasurhonkotáte. Huri patrate
jirentana rokoko hartanteá.
Pati rokoko harjáa, pati tijuko
uiniditana.

Ente Hasurhonkoá hatue te-
bakeda.

"Chi hale! dasipe dodoa chi?
Simkoing harnala."

Ente Hasurko kajitana:
Juna kuriko! lelípe. Enteko
lelkía. Enateko lelkíehiko chi-
chijadako, durdurjadako, béja-
dako. "Kalea, kale dodoa dasi.
Honkotale chalaúó, gaṇṇa-
kotale chalaúó." Ente aiar ha-
tutee senójana.

"Chi hale! dasipe dodoa chi!
etc. . . gaṇṇakotale chalaúó.
Ju senó me! hansá tolate senó-
me, Mundaking menákinga
Lut'kum harám Lut'kum, buría.
Inking asid', honko bangkuá,
ḡndageaking. Aledo kalea."

Ente inkingtáe senójana.

Chi hale! jiangking tatang-
king, menábenachitabu.

Inking dasiking dokía. Ente
simkoe harnalatana.

Ente musing hulang dine
kajiakingtana: Simjarom nama-
tukaingpe, gaúte haiajáíña.
Enteking namatukáia. Ente
Hasurhonkotáe senójana.
Inkuló inung nagene senó-
tana. Akoa' meyed' guli, kasra
kora' simjarom guli Hasur-
honko kapajitana: simjaromtae
trapud'eabu, lad'eabu, Mara

Then Singbonga took hold of him by the top-
knot of hair and shook him. He got out of his skin
(like a snake). With that skin Singbonga clothed
himself. Then he went away to the Asurs. He
twirls a leafed branch of a huribush round about
himself to drive away the flies. As many flies as
would fill a pati (*grain-measure containing two
pounds*) are driving him; he goes along dropping
a pati full of maggots.

Then he reached the Asurs' village.

Chi hale! will any of you engage a servant?
I will gain my wage by driving off the fowl (from
the grain).

Then the Asurs said: He! you women! have
a look at him. Then they looked at him. And
then having seen him, they (say) chichi! they (say)
away! away! they spit. We won't! we don't
engage a servant. Our children will be infected;
our offspring will be infected. Then he went
to the next village.

Chi hale! will any of you, etc. (*as above*) . .
. . . . our offspring will be infected. Get
away! go to the hamlet yonder; there there are two
Mundas: Lutkum the old man (and) Lutkum's
old wife. They perchance (will engage thee),
there are no children; they are childless. As for
us, we won't (engage thee). Then he went to
those two.

Chi hale! you two my grandmother and my
grandfather, are you two at home, are we you
and I?

Those two engaged him as a servant. Then he
gains his wage by driving off the fowl (from
the spread-out grain).

Then some day he says to both of them: Do
get some eggs for me. On account of my wounds
I experience a strong craving for them. Then
they got them for him. Then he went to the
Asurs. He goes to play with them. They (had)
iron marbles; the itch-covered boy had eggs for
marbles. The Asurs said to each other: we shall
break his eggs; we shall fry them, they say.
All right, do thou first place thy marbles. He first
placed his marbles. Then they did not hit his

oraumeko metaitana. Orauke-dae. Ente iniá guli kako tókeda. Ente, mar ape oraupée menjada. Ente iniá gulikedae. Ente simjarom gulite mered' gulikoe tókorapudkeda. Ente inku ringinjanako. Aurile u d u b' m e a Lut'kumharamta-kingt'áre ! Babado patireking tasitukaad/meaking ; simko jomchabakedako menjada.

Enate harám buriaking-táre enkateko udub'keda. Buriá Kisiótanae : "Chinalang jōma ! soben simko jomchabakeda. Ne kasra kōra dasi kalang do-doiang metad/mea ; doigeal-angem menkeda."

Miad' baḥajang en kasra-kōra halangrupakeda. Patiree dokeda, pati peréjana ; orátee idikedá. Sehelree, dokeda, sehel peréjana. Tunkiree dokeda, tunki peréjana. Határee dokeda, hatá peréjana.

Ente harám buriaking lelkedaking.

Okoéá am kumburukedam menteking kajiitana ?

"Jetaeá jiangking tatangking kaing kuburutada. Abuáge saratingtana-baratingtana. Sing-bongae omabutana."

Ente oḡo etá hulangrá din : aben hale ! Jiangking tatangking lupúlád' baiatukaingben, gaute haiajáña mentee kajiakingtana. Ente inking lupúlád'king baiáia. Ente lupúlád' sab'ked'tee senó-jana Hasurhonkotá inungte.

Ente inku : Mara lupúlád' katitam, oraumeko metaitana. Ente inku katikeda, kako tó-keda. Mar nado ape oraupée metad'koa. Ente katikeda. Katikotako rapudótana, mered'

marbles. Then, all right now you place your marbles. Then he rolled his marbles. Then with his egg-marbles he hit and broke the iron marbles. Then they took it ill. Just thou wait a while, we shall denounce thee to old Lutkum and his wife. Sure they had spread paddy on a mat for thee (to watch it) ; the fowl have eaten it all up, they say.

Then they reported like that to the old couple (the old man, the old woman—both). The old woman gets angry : What are we going to eat ! the fowl have eaten up every grain of it. Let us not engage this itch-covered boy as a servant, I told thee ; we (thou and I) will certainly engage him thou saidst.

The itch-covered-boy picked up again one grain of paddy. He placed it on the mat—the mat got filled. He took it (the grain) to the house. He put it into the husking pit—the husking pit got filled. He put it into the basket—the basket got filled. He put it on the winnowing shovel—the winnowing shovel got filled.

Then the old couple saw this.

Whose (paddy) didst thou steal, saying, both said to him ?

I have stolen nobody's (paddy), my grandmother (both), my grandfather (both). Yours and mine (paddy) is increasing (getting plentiful). Sing-bonga gives it to us.

Then again on some other day : Halé you two ! my grandmother, my grandfather, prepare some husk-bread for me. On account of (my) wounds I feel a strong craving for it. Then the two prepared husk-bread for him. Then taking up those husk-cakes he went away to the Asurs to play.

Then they : Go on use the husk-cakes as kati, place (thy) kati first, they tell him. Then they threw their katis, they did not hit. Go on now you place your katis, he told them. Then he threw his kati. Their katis break, iron katis with a kati made of husk-cake. Then they did not take it

katiko lupúládkatite. Ente inku ringinijana, etc.

Ente Hasurhonko mered'e ghatauked'koa. Ente: dea! chaulijang lelalem! kasrakorako metaitana.

Dub'ó kaing daria, gau hasu-jáña, chilekateng lelapea mentee kajiruraad'koa. Ente inku senóruratanke taikena.

Daea! omaingpe chaulijang, gitillelekaing mentee kajiruraad'koa. Ente setá hijápeng udubapea.

Ente inku setáko senrurajana. Chia? chilekatem namkedako kulijáia?

Singbongare punði sim bongaipe, intangtape meredóá.

Ente inku punði simko bongakía; ente huringlekatako mered'jana. Enteko rasikajana.

Ente oró etá hulangtako ghataujana. Ente oró chaulijangko idiruráia. Daea lelalem chaulijang, mered'tale ghataujana. Hela gaute kaing dub'dariae metakotana. Ente Hasurhonko hijururatanke taikena. Ente: da! omaingpe, gitillelekaing, setá rurapee kajiruraad'koa. Setá angjanchi en Hasurhonko sennamkiako. Chiam lelad'leam menteko kulijáia? Punði bakra bongaipe, huringlekatape meredóá. Ente bakrako bongakíatetako mered'jana. Ente inku rasikajana.

Ente oró etá hulang, etc. . . . Singbongare bale mindi bongaipe. Inku bale mindi bongakite mered' huringlekatako

well, etc. (as above, viz., the accusation and the multiplication of grain).

Then he caused the Asurs to run short of their supply of iron. Then, Come now! do please examine the rice-grains for us (i.e., act as soothsayer for us that we may know what sacrifice is needed in our present distress) they said to the itch-covered boy.

I cannot even sit down: (my) wounds are paining me so; how can I examine (the rice-grains) for you, saying he replied to them. Then they were going to go away.

Come, then! give me the rice-grains. I shall examine them lying down as I am, saying he replied to them. Then you come (in the) morning, I shall show you (what's required).

Then (next) morning they went back (to him): Well? how hast thou found matters to stand, they ask him?

In (honour of) Singbonga you sacrifice a white fowl; then you will find iron (then to you iron will become).

Then they sacrificed a white fowl, whereupon they found a little iron. Then they rejoiced.

Then again some other day their (iron) ran short. Then once more they took the rice-grains to him. Come now do please examine the rice-grains for us: our iron has run short. Alas, I am unable to sit up on account of my wounds, he says to them. Then the Asurs were on the point of coming away again. Then, come then! give them (rice-grains) to me. I shall try to examine them whilst lying down; come back in the morning, he replied to them. In the morning, as the day broke, the Asurs went to (find) him. Well, hast thou examined them for us they ask him? Sacrifice a white he-goat, you will (then) find a little iron. Then having sacrificed the he-goat they found iron. And then they rejoiced.

Then, again, etc. (as above) . . . Sacrifice a young sheep in honour of Singbonga. Having sacrificed a young sheep they found a little iron. Then they rejoiced, because he had shown them

mered'jana. Ente inku, besu-
dubad'buae menteko rasika-
jana.

Ente etá bulang orótako
ghataujana, etc. Chiam
namad'lea menteko kulijáia. He
aing namad'pea mentes kajiako-
tana: Horo-daprejanatapeae
metad'koa. Enate inku haikate-
janako. Hela kasrakoŕa, okorele
nemiako kajiruraitana. Ju! se-
nópe Doisa parganate, Kukura
parganate; enre Mundako me-
nákoa. Kulikope! chi akiring-
koape mente kulikope. Hela
chikanateko omalea, chinatele
kiringiako metaitana. Ente:
ne kakaruking samroming oma-
petana; senópe ju! Kiringtee
metad'koa.

Ente inku Doisa parganateko
senójana: Chi hale! horokope
akiringkoape chi menteko kuli-
jad'koa; bongaiale!

Okoea namtana engateá roga!
dalipe! Mod'baleatebu asultáia!
Bongainí okoe namtana dalipe!

Ente inku nirjanako. Enate
kasrakoŕako metaitana: Hela
kale namkia horo!

Chilekape kajikeda?

Chigheu! honkope akiring-
koape chi? bongaiale mentele
kajikotana.

Enaddoe? metakotana.

Nirjanaleko metaitana.

Ainggea tobe! bongakingpee
metakotana. Gaute erágeng
dukutana, nida singi harangige
lingitana mente kajikotanae.

Ente Lutkum haram Lutkum
buria kaling omma menteking
kajiruraitana; okoe orá horo-
alinga?

the right sacrifice (then he has shown us aright,
saying they rejoiced).

Then again some other day again their (iron) ran
short, etc. (as above). Well, hast thou found it
(the kind of sacrifice) for us, they ask him. Yes,
I have found it out for you, he says to them: A
human sacrifice has become (necessary) for you,
he told them. Then they became dumbfounded.
Alas, itch-covered boy, where will we find one (a
man) they reply to him. Go to the Doisa district,
to the Kukura district; there there are Mundas.
Ask them! he! do you sell them (men) ask them.
Alas, for what (as price) will they give to us (a
man), with what shall we buy him, they say to
him. Then I give you these two pumpkins,
(they are) gold; all right! go now to buy, he said
to them.

Then they went to the Doisa parganah: Chi
hale! do you sell men, saying, they asked them;
we are going to sacrifice one!

Who then is asking a mother's darling (a child)!
hit him! From the tenderest childhood we have
reared him! The one who wants to sacrifice him
strike him!

Then they ran away, and then they tell the
itch-covered boy: Alas, we have not got a man!

How did you say (ask)?

Chigheu! do you sell children? we are going
to sacrifice one, saying we told them.

And then (what happened?) he says to them.

We ran away they tell him.

Here am I myself then! do sacrifice me, he
says to them. I am suffering much pain on
account of my wounds; matter is flowing out day
and night he says to them.

Then the old man Lutkum and Lutkum's old
wife: We won't give thee (up), saying both of
them said, who will watch our house for us?

Inkingemetakingtana : Bonga-kingkako jiangking tatangking !

Ka amo! okoe alingdo asulinga ?

Aben aloben urúa! asulógeaben. Aben táreng kajitukatana. Chi nea kaji udubabentanaing metadkinga. Ape Mundahonkotáre ne kaji taínka mente kajitukaad'kinga. Hatu talare pahará hon sing subareng dubatukaiaing. Ini aben mainbena, báre misa, bataulire misa, magere misa.

Inking : he martob! ne kaji kaling riringea mente king kajiruraitana.

Ente Hasurhonko idikía bongai nagen.

Ente inku auri bongai sida-ree kajiad'koa: Pundi merom bakra potaípe ur, naua ghandiking baípe, naua binghal baípe, baba-holong rurungepe, kodeholong rurunggundaépe; dinda kuriking rurungeka mentee kajiad'koa, katabakanate.

Mar nádo iladepe!

Ente en kutite bolotanimtang kajiatukaakotana : Dinda kuriking sipudeka, api ma katabakanate. Nida singiking sipudeka. Sutambinda naua chatute dáking auka, uli daurateking hirschienpreka! Mar! nádoing bolojana, iladkesedingpe!

Enatedoking sipud'keda nida singi. Enatedo api ma hoba-

To those two he says : Do let them sacrifice me my grandmother dear, my grandfather dear !

No thou too! (*i.e.*, what doest thou think of) who then will support me and her ?

As for you two, don't worry yourselves! You will surely be supported. I leave my word for it to you two. Now this promise I reveal to you two, he says to both of them. Let this word of mine remain (be ever remembered) amongst you Mundas, he impressed it on them (he impressively said to them) : I will seat the pahan's son (the sacrificer) under a tree in the middle of the village. He will sacrifice to you, (*i.e.*, he will offer to you two the essences or souls of the fruits, flowers, and animals he sacrifices) once on the flower feast, once on the batauli feast, and once on the mag feast.

Then both of them: All right then! he and I (we two) won't forget this word, saying they reply to him.

Then the Asurs led him away in order to sacrifice him.

Then before they sacrificed him he said to them: take the skin of a white he-goat (*to make bellows with*) make new bellow-sticks, prepare a new bellow-nozzle, husk rice into flour, husk marrua (*a small grain*) into flour; let two virgins do the husking after having fasted, saying he said to them.

All right now plaster up (the furnace).

Then at the moment he was entering into that furnace he impressed it upon them (as follows): Let two virgins who have fasted since three days work the bellows. Let them work the bellows by night and by day. Let them on a head-cushion made of cotton thread bring water in a new earthen pot and let them extinguish the fire by sprinkling (water on) it with a twig of a mango-tree. All right! now I have entered; plaster me up!

Then the two (virgins) worked the bellows day and night. Then when three days had passed,

janchi sutambinda naua chatute dáking agulá, uli daurateking hirschieprekedaking. Enate kutiking rurunguturkeda.

Enate angtanleka turtan. lekae urunglena. Sona rupatege somparauakanae; lota tari-gee sabana.

Khubchi menáko kulijáia?

Hap! hap! khub mená men-tee kajiakotana. Hagape sangia, apedo purápe aguea. Enate: kutiundute bolopee metaad'koa, kora hon bhari! Korahonko aguchabakope; taiomtepe repéa karedo. Ente, sirmare sonadidi rupadidiking jalatingtana. Mar suba seromilte lelnamkobon, chuti kangsulilte lelnamkobon, merako ukuna, mentee kajia-kotana.

Hasurhonkodo: chabajanale menteko kajiaitana. Korahonko-bhari sobenkole auchabaked'koa.

Ente inku sobenko bolocha-bajanchi: marna kuriko! ilad'kesed'epe bichadurate kuiladurate! Ilad'kesed'kedako. Marna kuriko! sengel salgau ad' sipudepe! Sipud'jadako; ena' tedom kutichetanre kuilako dul-jada ad' khub'ko sipud'jada. Chaiñ chuñtanko ragoéntana.

Helaea! am bedaked'leako metaitana.

Marna kuriko sipudepe! repétanako, kako dongótana! sekerage sipudepe!

Entedo lada ladatan urungótana maiom gera horate nari horate.

they brought water in new earthen pots on head-cushions made of cotton-thread; they extinguish the fire by sprinkling (water on) it with twigs of a mango-tree. Then they broke the furnace down with husking poles.

Then he came out like the dawn, like the rising sun. He is covered with golden and with silver ornaments; he holds a drinking vessel and a plate.

Is there plenty more of it (treasure), they ask him?

Yes! yes! there is plenty more of it, saying he tells them. You are many brethren, You'll be able to bring out a lot of it. And then: enter through the hole of the furnace, he said to them; Men only (will do)! Bring together all the men, or else later on you will rob from each other. And then: under the roof (of the furnace) a golden and a silver vulture both are soaring. Examine them underneath at the feathers under the wings and at the feathers which are at the end of the wings, perchance they may hide (their treasure) saying he tells them.

But the Asurs: we are all here, saying they tell him. So far as the men are concerned, we have brought all of them together here.

Then when all of them had entered: all right! now you women, plaster up (the furnace) with iron-ore dust and with coal-dust. They plastered it up. All right! now you women, light the fire and work the bellows! They work the bellows. Then on the top of the furnace they pour coal and they work the bellows with energy. (Those inside) are crying desperately *chaiñ chuñ*.

Alas, thou hast cheated us they (the women) say to him.

'Tis all right now you, women! work the bellows! They are robbing each other; they do not all get enough; work the bellows fast!

And then the blood flows out abundantly through the passage for molten refuse and through the air-passage of the bellows.

Heleam ! bedaked'lea, chi maiom naeadoke metaitana.

Kana ! kuriko, pan kasailiko jomtana, enako béurungjada. Marna kuriko ! khub sipud'tabepe, sekerage !

Ente, rongojan torked'kochi, rurungutunrepe mentee kajiad'koa.

Enteko rurungutunprekeda. Jang eskargeko namkeda, ranka-roretanko namkeda.

Helaeam bedaked'lea ! nakamente kale torked'mea ! Koyakotale sipud'goérikaked'leam menteko kajaitana.

Hela na ! kerketa jagu, dingchua maru kuldutamled'kinga-ing. Inkingá kaji kape manatingjana mentee kajia kotana. Ente : aifá hal hukumpe manatinga chi na mentee kajia kotana.

Haple manatingako men. Kale manatingkóre *chilekatele* asulóa oróko metaitana.

He martobe ! asulótea horaing udubapea mentee kajirurakotana.

Patguru, Tura chelaking dotukakingtana. Hula bara chaulijang, sete bara kudijang dia sengel poro sengelteko *salam pitinampeako*. Patguru Turachela inkingtäre alope ukuna menteng kajia petana.

Hatu talare Mundahon pahapre taina, sing suba, daru suba. Manatingpeae metad'koa.

Eñate inf sirmatee rakabentana.

Alas thou hast deceived us ! isn't this blood, they say to him.

No you women ! they are eating pan and kssaili, it is that they are spitting out. Go on now ! you women, work the bellows fast with energy, quickly !

Then, when he knew that they were burnt, now break the furnace with your husking poles, he said to them.

Then they broke it with husking poles. They found only bones, rattling dry they found them (the bones).

Alas ! thou hast deceived us. We did not think that thou wouldst act like that ! Thou hast made us burn our men to death.

Well now ? I sent the watchful kerketa and the energetic kingcrow as messengers (to you). You did not obey their orders, saying he told them. And then : will you then now obey my commands and orders, saying he says to them.

Yes, we will obey, they say. Unless we obey, *how in the world* can we find a living ! they say to him.

All right then ! I shall show you a means (way) whereby you will be supported, saying he answers.

I am going to establish the Patguru and his disciple Tura, both of them (the sooth sayers). These two will consult you (*approach you for advice, approach you for direction*) by means of half-broken rice-grains, by means of half-husked kudi grains, by means of lamplight, by means of straw-torch light. I order you not to abscond (not to hide anything) from the Patguru and Turachela (*i.e., always reveal to them the causes of disease and the sacrifices required*).

In the middle of the village a Munda shall dwell as sacrificer, under a tree, under a tree. He will worship you he said to them.

After that he rises to heaven.

Entedo en Hasurkupiko iniá lijáreko sabentana. Ente chutaub're sab'ked'kochi hurang-giriked'koea.

Burure uiújaní burubongajanae, ikiye uiújaní ikirbongajanae, piri uiújaní oró lor tundu-kóre nagebongajanae; ente marang burure uiújana, marang burubongajanae, desaulire uiújaní desaulibongajana, chondorikiye uiújaní chondorikibongajanae, chandire uiújaní chandibongajanae.

And then those Asur women cling to his clothes. Then he, catching them by the top-knot of hair threw them down.

The one (who) fell on a hill became a burubonga, the one (who) fell into deep water became an ikirbonga, the one who fell on high fields or near the end of ravines became a nagebonga; then the one who fell on a high mountain became a marang burubonga, he who fell on a wooded spot became a desaulibonga, he who fell on a wooded spot near a spring (low ground) became a chondoribonga, he who fell into a grove on the open field or a height became a chandibonga.

II.

RICE-CULTIVATION AND AN ORDINARY DAY'S WORK IN A MUNDA VILLAGE.

(Written by JOHANN RONGO, a Mundari school-boy).

Sidako síchataea, enateko ruraea. Apisáko síked'chiko taerikaea. Enate dá gamakeate ka-chaluakad arikoko chaluea. Tara sidare chaluakad ariko herjetea jetesingirege. Asar ad' Sawan chandú tebakóchi sobenko achraea oró taramarako roaea. Sobenko herchabakead' enate omonoa, omonjanate maparangoa. Enate soben loeongko durumleka leloa. Enate huringleka pandu pandu lelóimtangko karaea; karaeateko hokaes. Enate babako dembooa, ente geleoa, enate toako pereoa, enate enage sakid'kóchi jaromoa.

Jaromjanatedoko irea; datromteko irked'chi kolomteko godupilea oró tara marakodo sagariteko har-rakabea. Enate kolomreko paroia. Paroeate oroko arguea ad'ko daupria (enea). Laud'janchiko kotaea, enateko aturea. Peté babakodoko auea. Enateko potomea. Potomko

First they open (the ground) by ploughing, then they replough. Having ploughed it three times, they let it lie. Then after it has rained (once) they hoe those fields which they had not hoed before. Some fields which they had hoed before they summer-sow in the hot season itself. When the month of Asar and Sarvan has arrived, all sow in the water (standing in the fields) and some people plant (i.e., transplant the seedlings). When all have finished sowing then it springs up, having sprung up it grows big. After that all the rice-fields look one mass of green. After that, when it begins to look a little greyish they press it down (by dragging a long piece of wood over it); having pressed it down they stop (i. e. there is nothing more to be done). Then the paddy grows into incipient ears, then it forms ears, then (the grains) become filled with milk, then when that has solidified, it ripens.

After it has ripened they reap it; having cut it with the sickle they carry it on their shoulders (the men) and on their heads (the women) to the threshing floor, and some do drive it up on sagars (bullockcarts). Then on the threshing floor they place the sheaves with the ears upwards (to dry entirely). After having thus dried them, they thresh it (by driving cattle over it round and round). When it has become soft, they shake (out the grain from the straw) then they winnow it. The

sagariteko haridia; oráko teba-ked'chi potomko aderea adingre, Tara potomko hitaea, tarako jomea.

Sidate miad' potomko bon-goéa. Ena sidako hondéa, enate jeteroko tasia, enate roro-janchi sehelre tukuteko rurungea, enate chauli urungoá. Soben auri chaulichabaóimtang setéakanako metá; mipia'd mipiad'eskar babako taiúimtang talaakanako metá. Miad'o baba banó ad' burud'leka chauli pharchi lelóimtang sóakanako metá. Enchauligeko mandia.

Mandi imtang sida dáko ladia, enate basangoá. Basang-janchi chauliko harub'ea, enate mandi isinoá.

Isinjanchi chipiko gasarea; gasarked'chi mandiko hatingea; hatingked'chi korakoko kajia-koa: abungenpe! Enateko abungena enate mandiko joma. Enate kuriko joma ad' soben kurihonko. Sobenko jomked'chi, hon hopon apan apan giti jomtekoa.

Setá angkóte soben apan apan kamitekoa: kurikodo setá guriko giria ad' korakodo uriko pasartekoa, ad' honkodo sengeltáre dubakanko (dubakante) jiruba ad' jetekeťé ked'chi honko merom urí gupitekoa, oró korako siú kamia. Tikinjanteko rarakoa ad' arararakoko gókead' karkadenteko senóa. Karkad'kóate orátekoa ad' tikin mandiko joma.

empty husks they throw away, those with seeds in them they take (keep). Then they pack it into bales. The bales they carry (drive) away on sagars; having reached home they put the bales into the store-room. Some bales they reserve for seed, the others they eat.

At first they make a hole into one bale. That (grain which they take out daily through this hole) they parboil, then they spread it out on a mat in the sun. Then when it has become dry, they husk it with husking poles in the husking pit, and then clean rice comes out. At the time when all is not yet become perfectly clean rice, they call it *seté* (they say: it is become *seté*, *i.e.*, husks begin to fall off). When only here and there a grain of unhusked rice remains, they call it *tala i.e.*, half clean. When not even one grain of unhusked rice is left and the rice looks shining white, they call it *só*, *i.e.*, clean rice. That rice they cook for food.

When cooking they (the women) first put water (in a pot) on the fire, then that boils. When it has become boiling they pour in the rice and then it gets cooked into food.

When it is cooked they clean (scrub) the brass-vessels; having cleansed them they deal out the cooked rice; having dealt it out they say to the men: wash yourselves! Then they take a wash and then they eat their food. And then the women and the girls eat their food. When all have eaten then every one (literally: child and grandchild) betake themselves to their night's rest.

In the morning when the day has broken, all betake themselves to their work: the women they clean the stables (they throw out the cowdung), and the men they turn out the cattle to graze and the children, they being seated near the fire warm themselves, and when the sunshine has become strong the children go to graze the goats and cattle and the men go to the ploughing work. When it has become noon they unyoke them (the oxen) and, carrying the yokes on their own shoulders, they go to brush their teeth (at the nearest stream or pool); having brushed their teeth they go home and take their midday meal.

III.

HARAM BURIKINGA KAHANI.

Baria haramburiaking hore-
king herlá. Enaddo janau
saráko hore jonko sentan tai-
kena. Enamente janau haramdo
hore hore sentan taikena.

Enaddo musing hulang hasue
baintan taikena oró buriæ
kajiáia: Ama, buriatalang aing
hasuing baina oró amtalang
ráeme oró neka kajime: Okoe
gore! ne haramko iditukairedo
gota goṛa horeing omakoa.

Enaddo hasue bainjana oró
buria rátane taikena: Okoe
gore! ne haram iditukairedo
gota goṛa horeing omakoa
menjada.

Entedo banda sará rátane
aiumlíæ. Enaddo sarákoæ kajia-
kotana: oko buria ratanae me-
takotana? Enad'doko kajiaita-
na: Okorea! banda amge erá-
gem aiumjad'koa metaitanako!
Auritoa! oró misabu aiumliæ
menjada. Enaddo oróæ rájada:
Okoe gore! ne haramko iditu-
kairedo gota goṛa horeing oma-
koa! Enatedoko aiumlíæ.

Enad'doko niraulá, enatedoko
kulijáia: Chikanam menláko
metaitana? Enaddoe kajia-
koa: Kaea babu! ne haram-
derang okoe iditukaia gota goṛa
horeing omakoa.

Enatedoko kajiáia: Alo bu-
riam ráæ! Mar iditukaialeko
metaitana. Enad'doko sab'kia
ad'ko idikíæ.

Enad'do oráko tebakéd'chiko
kajiaitaina: Chi buria! netárele
dotaiaiko metaitana? Enad'doe

Two married people (an old man, an old woman) had sown kurti (*a coarse pulse*). And then the baboons were always going to eat the kurti. Therefore the old man was always going to watch the kurti.

Then one day he was going to feign sickness (making himself sick), and he said to the old woman: Thou he! my dear old wife (thou he! old woman thou and I!) I will pretend to be sick and thou, my dear, cry and say like this: Alas! if any one would carry this old man away, I would give them a whole field of kurti.

Then he pretended to be sick and the old woman was crying: Alas! if any one would carry this old man away, I would give them a whole field of kurti.

Then a tailless baboon (one who had lost his tail) first heard her crying. Then he says to the baboons: Listen! What old woman is crying, he says to them? Then they say to him: Whereat all! thou tailless one, thou art hearing them very much indeed! they say to him. Just wait awhile! We shall first listen to her once more he says. And then she cries once more: Alas! if any one were to carry this old man away, I would give to them a whole field of kurti! and then they heard her.

And then they came running up to her and then they ask her: What didst thou say, they say to her? And then she said to them: What I mean to say is this, sir! (No, indeed! sir) if any one will carry this old man away, I will give them a whole field of kurti.

And then they said to her: Don't cry, old woman! (Don't old woman thou cry!) all right we shall carry him away, they say to her. Then they took hold of him and they carried him away.

And then having reached the house they say to her: What (do you say) old woman! shall we put him down and leave him here, they say to her?

kajiad'koa: Kaea! hen gon-
rasáte idiipe metad'koa. Enate-
doko idikía. Enaddo buria
duare handed'tada oꝛo koꝛae
metaitana: lelcoma, talanga!
goṭa goṛa hoꝛeko jomchabajada
koe metaitana.

Enad'do hakege sab'tab'kedae
oꝛoe mágoéked'koa.

Then she said to them: No dear! take him to that
stable yonder, she said to them. And then they took
him (thither) and then the old woman fastened
the door down and said to (her) husband: Look
to them, my dear! they are eating up a whole
field of kurti! she says to him.

Then he (the husband) quickly laid hold of his
axe and killed them by cutting them to pieces.

ALPHABETIC TABLE OF CONTENTS.

- A* as Prefix to Indirect Pronominal Objects—*Introd.*, li; *Gr.*, 14 (3rd); 38 to 42.
A as Copula in the ordinary or personal construction—*Introd.*, XXXVIII to XLVIII; *Gr.*, 116 (3rd).
A as Copula in the impersonal construction—(see Impersonal Construction).
A as formative element in the Indeterminate Tense and in the Simple Future—124 to 129.
A as Impersonal Pronoun—12 and 20.
A as Possessive Genitive affix to Nouns and Pronouns—89 (6th).
A as Suffix to the Possessive Affixes *taing*, *tam*, etc.—107.
A as Affix to Nouns and Pronouns governed by Compound Postpositions—42 to 45.
A as formative element of Nouns—188.
A and *Á*. Identity of—in all the above functions—46 (*Note*) and 125 to 129.
 Probable identity of *a* or *á* with Passive Affix *ó*—153 to 155.
Ability—signified by reduplication—183 (3rd).
Ablative—(see *Case*).
Absence—denoted by *banó*—172.
Abstraction—Influence of abstract thought on Organic words—*Introd.*, XIII to XX.
 Influence of abstract thought on Mundari words—*Introd.*, XX to XXXII.
 Influence of abstract thought on the Organic Proposition—*Introd.*, XL.
 Influence of abstract thought on the Mundari proposition.—*Introd.*, XL, etc.
Abstract Nouns—108 and 120 (1).
Accident—Definition of—XLII;—as basis of division of judgments—XLII;—
 as basis of division of Mundari propositions—XLIII, etc.
Accusative—(see *Case*).
Active Voice—(see *Voice*).
Adjectives—Formation of—108 to 110 Number and kind of—*Introd.*, XIII to XVI.
 Not affected by Gender and Number 5—Comparison of—110 and 111.
Adverbs of Place—70 to 75;—of Manner—76 to 79;—of Quantity—75 to 76;
 —of Time—79 to 80. Adverbial Affixes—78, 79 and 200.
Affirmation—made by Transitive use of Affirmative Particles—112 and 221.
Affirmative Particles—83.
Affixes—(see *Roots*).
Agency—Nouns of—their formation—*Introd.*, XXVIII (1st); *Gr.*, 120 (3).
Agreement between Subject and Predicate. Necessity of a Subjective Pronominal
 Affix to Predicates agreeing in Number and Person with Subject—
 Introd., XXXV, etc. Exception to this rule—29.

Alphabet—1 to 4.

Ancestor-worship—(see *Religion*).

Anterior Tenses—(see *Tense*).

Approximation, how expressed—68.

Article—5.

Aryan languages—(see *Organic languages*).

Assent—expressed by the transitive use of Affirmative Particles—112 and 221.

As, to bring. Idiomatic use of—in Compound Predicates—194, 195.

Avowal—expressed by the transitive use of Affirmative Particles—112 and 221.

Bag, to abandon. Idiomatic use of—in Compound Predicates—191, 192.

Bai, to make. Idiomatic use of—in compound Predicates—195.

Be (to—)—how rendered in Mundari—180 to 182.

Become (to—)—rendered by *a*—125; rendered by *o*—152 to 155.

Beginning—rendered by *efē*—199; rendered by reduplication—183.

Being in general—denoted by *a*—126.

Bonga—(see *Religion*).

Burial customs—*Introd.*, VII, VIII, IX.

Cardinal Numbers—(see *Numerals*).

Case—Definition of—*Introd.*, LIII, LIV (III); *Gr.*, 86.

Formation of Cases in Mundari—86 to 93.

Nominative Case in Organic languages—*Introd.*, XXXVI.

—in Mundari—*Introd.*, XXXVIII (5).

—Position of—in the Mundari proposition—86.

—in a certain sense pertaining to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates *Introd.* LIV (2).

Genitive Case—split up into five Locatives in Mundari—86 (4) to 89.

Dative Case—Form and function of—in Organic languages—*Introd.*, XLVIII (2).

—in Mundari—*Introd.*, XLIX and LIII; *Gr.*, 86. Organic Datives of advantage or disadvantage sometimes rendered by Postpositions *tāte* or *tāre*—*Introd.*, L (I), LII, LIII; sometimes by the Postposition *d*—43 (4th) (b), 46 (3rd).

—in a certain sense pertaining to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates—*Introd.*, LIV (2).

Accusative Case—Form and function in Organic languages.—*Introd.*, XLVIII (2).

—in Mundari—*Introd.*, XLIX and LIII; *Gr.*, 86.

—Position of—in the Mundari proposition—86.

—So-called Double Accusative Constructions in Mundari—49 and 92.

—in a certain sense pertaining to Transitive and Intransitive Predicates—*Introd.*, LIV (2).

Case—concluded.

Locative Cases—Ordinary Locatives of Rest or Motion—90 (IX) to 91 (XII).

Instrumental Case—91 (XII and XIII).

Allative Case—92 (XIV).

Vocative Case—92 (XV).

Causality—implied by *d*—154.

Causatives—198.

Cause—denoted by *te*—37 (a) and 209; by *mente*—210; by *rd*—210.

Cessation—rendered by *hoka*, 199.

Checked Vowels and Consonants—3.

Circumstances as a factor in determining actual functions of Mundari words—*Introd.*, XX, XXI, etc.

Clause—General outlines of—*in Organic languages*—*Introd.*, IV; *in Mundari*—*ibid* and *Introd.*, XXV and XVIII to XXI; *Gr.*, 119 to 122 (II).

General directions for rendering English subordinate clauses into Mundari—*Introd.*, LV, LVI.

I.—**Relative Clauses**—201.

II.—**Conditional Sentences**—203.

III.—**Circumstantial—of Time**—207.

IV.—**Causal**—209.

V.—**Final**—211.

VI.—**of Manner**—212.

VII.—**Restrictive**—213.

VIII.—**Correlative—of Manner**—214.

IX.—**Correlative—of place**—214.

Commencement—(see *Beginning*).

Comparison
Comparative degree } (see *Adjectives*).

Compounds—Formation of Compound Nouns, Adjectives and Transitive or Intransitive Predicates—183 to 200.

Compleatives—199.

Concession—(see *Concessive Mood* under *Mood*).

Concomitance—expressed by *ló*—38; by *re* affixed to Tense-forms—207 (1); by *lô* affixed to Tense-forms—203 (2).

Condition—expressed by *re*—203.

Conditional clauses—(see *Clause*).

Conditional Conjunctions—81 (4th).

Conditional Mood—(see *Conditional Clauses* under *Clause*).

Conjugation—*Introd.*, III, IV and XXV and LIV (III).

Organic Conjugations compared with the corresponding Mundari process—112 to 133.

Structural differences between Organic—and the corresponding Mundari process—112 to 119 and 129, 130.

Conjugation—concluded.

Functional differences between Organic—and the corresponding Mundari process—119 to 129.

Fundamental similarity between Organic—and the corresponding Mundari process—128.

Number of conjugations in Organic languages contrasted with the uniformity of the corresponding Mundari process—129.

Subdivision of the Mundari process into the Personal and the Impersonal construction—129, 130.

Conjunctions—80.

Connexion—Method of connecting Subject and Predicate in Organic languages and in Mundari—(see *Proposition*.)

Contact between Subjective Pronominal Affix and Transitive or Intransitive Predicates as connotative of the logical relation between Subject and Predicate—(see *Proposition*).

————— between Objective Pronominal Affix and Transitive Predicates as connotative of the logical relation between those Predicates and their Direct or Indirect Objects in Mundari—(see *Proposition*).

Consonants—1, 2.

Construction, Personal and Impersonal—(see *Conjugation* : Subdivision of, etc.).

Context as a factor in determining the actual meaning and function of Mundari roots and words—*Introd.*, XX to XXXII; *Gr.*, 8.

Contemporaneousness—denoted by *re*—207; by *lô*—208; by *rá*—209.

Continuation—expressed by *aiar*—53; by *idi*—195; by Continuative Present—149.

Co-ordination of roots in Isolating languages—*Introd.*, II.

————— of words in certain Mundari compounds—184.

————— of propositions (see *Proposition*).

Copula in Organic languages—*Introd.*, XXXVI, XXXVII; —in Mundari—*Introd.*, XXXVIII and *Gr.*, 124.

Reason for the existence of two distinct Copulas in Mundari—*Introd.*, XL to XLIV.

Corrective Particle—84.

Correlation—35.

Correlative Clauses—(see *Clauses*).

Correspondence between Subject and Predicate in case of Indefinite and Interrogative Pronouns, an idiomatic peculiarity—29.

Customs—Tense-form used in stating—134.

D as a substitute for *n* in Transitive Tense—Suffixes—164.

Native—(see *Cases*).

Day—how divided by Mundari—80.

Declension—(see *Cases*).

Defective Intransitive Predicates with regard to number of Tenses—172 to 178.

Defiance expressed by the Affix *ta*—132; by the Affix *len*—166.

CONTENTS.

- Degrees of Comparison*—(see *Comparison* under *Adjectives*).
- Deities*—(see *Religion*).
- Deluge*—No Mundari version of—*Introd.*, XII.
- Demonstratives*—(see *Roots*).
- Demonstrative Adjectives*—9 to 12.
- Demonstrative Pronouns*—26 to 32.
- Denotation as distinct from connotation* in Parts of Speech—*Introd.*, XVI to XX.
- Deprecative Particle*—170, 171.
- Desinences of Organic languages contrasted with the Suffixes of Agglutinative languages in general and of Mundari in particular.*—*Introd.*, II to IV.
- Development of roots into Parts of Speech*—*Introd.*, XVI to XXXII and *Gr.*, 108 to 110.
- Diacritic marks*—1 to 3.
- Dialects (Kholarian)*—*Introd.*, I.
- Die (to)*—rendered by *banó*—113.
- Dimension*—expressed by the Suffixes *rá* and *ren*—83 (3rd).
- Diphthongs*—1.
- Direction*—expressed by *te*—36 (1st); by *táte*—47 (1st); by *ats* or *ets*—51.
- Disjunctive Particles*—82 (5th).
- Dissent*—expressed by the intransitive use of the Negative Particle—175.
- Distinction (grammatical)* between living beings and inanimate objects—7.
 ————— between real existence and being or entity in general recognized in Mundari by the use of distinct words.—*Introd.*, XXXVIII and XLV; *Gr.*, 124 to 129.
- Doubt*—expressed by the Affixes *ja* and *tera*—84.
- Dual*—(see *Number*).
- Duration*—expressed by *táate*—49 (III, 1 and 2); by *jaked*—62; by *hamiate*—62.
- E, as a mere euphonic insertion before the Subjective Pronominal Affix m*—14 (2nd), 17 (2nd) and 18;—before the Copula *a* in Indeterminate Tense and Future—134;—before the Reflexive Tense—Infix, *n*—155.
- as a weak form of the Personal Pronoun é*—15 (1) and 16 (2 and 3) as Infix Direct Object denoting inanimate beings—135.
- Elements (formative)*—Definition of—*Introd.*, II (2).
- Elision in Case-Suffixes*—87 (1st), 90. (VIII) in Tense-Suffixes—*Introd.*, LII, LIII and *Gr.*, 140;—143 (VIII), 144.
- Emphasis*—(see *Emphatic Pronouns* under) *Pronouns* and *Emphatic Particles*—84, 85.
- Enumeration of inanimate objects*—Idiomatic use of Plural forms in—8 (2nd).
- Essence*—The concept of—as basis of the division of Mundari propositions into two classes.—*Introd.*, XLI, etc.
- Evolution of languages.*—*Introd.*, IV.
- Excuse*—rendered by *lá*—191; by *uter*—111.

- Existence*—(see *Distinction between real existence*, etc.).
- Exclusive Dual and Plural* (see *Number*).
- Family-connexions*—Possessive Affixes used with words denoting—88 (4th) and 98 (3rd).
- Feasibility*—expressed by the Passive Voice—53.
- Feelings and other subjective affections*—Construction used to denote—predictively—130 and 176.
- Functions of roots and words* in Organic languages compared with functions of Mundari roots and words—*Introd.*, XVI to XXXII.
- Future Tenses*—(see *Tense*).
- Futurity*—expressed in Mundari by the intransitive use of the Impersonal Pronoun, *a*—124 to 129.
- Gender*—5 to 7.
- Genitive*—(see *Case*).
- Giri*—to throw away. Idiomatic use of—in compounds—125.
- Ground-forms of Mundari Tenses*—116 to 119.
- Groups of languages*—*Introd.*, II.
- Habits*—Tense used to state—134.
- Harmony of vowels* in Agglutinative languages—*Introd.* IV; *Gr.*—4 and 26 (Rem., 1, 2 and 3).
- Hinduism*—Influence of—on the Kholarian religious and social systems (see *Religion*).
- Hundi*—to gather. Idiomatic uses of—in compounds—196.
- Imperative*—(see *Mood*).
- Imperfect Tenses*—(see *Tense*).
- Impersonal construction* in Mundari—129 and—172 to 180.
- Inceptives* formed by *eté* used as Suffix—199 and by reduplication of Perfect Tense—183.
- Inchoatives*—(see *Inceptives*).
- Incomplete Past*—(see *Tense*).
- Inclusive Duals and Plurals*—(see *Number*).
- Indeterminate Tense*—(see *Tense*).
- Indicative*—(see *Mood*).
- Infinitive*—(see *Mood*).
- Inflixes in Mundari*—(see *Objects, Reflexive Voice, Reciprocal Voice, Comparison of Adjectives* under *Adjectives* and *Abstract Nouns*, under *Abstraction*).
- Instrumentality* denoted by *te*—36 [2nd (a)] by *korate*—63; Nouns of—formed by the Affix *ted*—188.
- Instability of Mundari compounds*—*Introd.*, XXI, etc.
- Interjections*—83, 84.
- Interrogation*—11 (*Note 1*).
- Literaries*—199.

Judgment—Definition and description of—*Introd.*, XXXII, to XXXV.

Juxtaposition—Function performed by mere juxtaposition in Mundari compounds—184.

Khols—Kholarian tribes and Kholarian dialects. *Introd.*, I.

Lá—Idiomatic uses of—in compounds—191.

Legends (Kholarian)—*Introd.*, XII.

Lengthening of syllables—in elided Tense-forms—133;—used instead of reduplication—182.

Life—The concept of— as opposed to that of inanimate nature forming the basis of a far-reaching grammatical distinction in Mundari—7.

Locatives—(see *Case*).

Manner—expressed by *leka* and *lekate*—77, 78; by *te* 37 and 77; by *no*—78 (5); by *tab*, etc.—78 (6), 79.

Means—denoted by *te*—36 (2nd, a).

Mood—Definition of—131. Number of—in Mundari—131, 132.

Indicative—No characteristic affix—133.

Imperative—166 to 168.

Precative, Concessive or Optative—168 to 172.

Conditional—(see *Clause*).

Motion to and from—(see *Locatives* under *Case*).

Multiplication expressed by *sá* and *duang*—66, 67.

Munda—Meaning of the word in English and in Mundari—*Introd.*, I.

Negation—by means of the Particles *ka*, *bano*, *nalage*—83; by the transitive and intransitive use of *ka*—175.

Nominative—(see *Case*).

Non-existence denoted by *banó*.—*Introd.*, XLV and *Gr.*, 172;—conceived as distinct from the wider concept of non-entity—*Introd.*, XLV.

Numbers (grammatical)—7 to 9.

Inclusive Dual and Plural forms of Personal Pronouns—12.

Exclusive—12.

Idiomatic use of Dual—8, 9;—*of Plural*—8 (Remark), and see *Enumeration*.

Origin and meaning of Exclusive Plural forms—22;—*of Inclusive Plural forms*—23;—*of Inclusive and Exclusive Duals*—24 to 26.

Numerals—64 to 70.

Objects (Direct and Indirect)—Definition of,—*Introd.*, XLVIII (2).

—*in Organic languages*—XLVIII, XLIX;—*in Munda*—XLIX, L.

Reason for inserting Pronominal Objects into Mundari Predicates—*Introd.*, I to LIII; *position and form of Pronominal Objects in Mundari*—*Introd.*, XLIX and *Gr.*, 15 [(3) and 3rd]

Objects—concluded.

Reason for preserving original forms in the inserted Objects—18 (4h).

Insertion of Pronominal Objects causing phonetic changes in Tense-Suffixes
—138, 140, 143 (VIII), 145 (X), 146, 164 (*ked* and *akad*).

Order of words in the Proposition. Functions performed generally by—
Introd., XXXV.

Ownership as distinguished in Mundari from other relations—70 to 90.

Participles as distinct from *bare Tense-forms* in Organic languages—XXVII.

—identical with *bare Tense-forms* in Mundari—XXVII, XXVIII.

Participial clauses in Mundari—(see *Clause*).

Parts of Speech in Organic languages—*Introd.*, XVII to XX; —in Mundari—
XX to XXII.

Passive—(see *Voice*).

Past—(see *Tense*).

Patronymics—Formation of—94 to 97; —as Transitive and Intransitive
Predicates—218, 219.

Peré—to fill. Idiomatic use of—in compounds—195.

Perfect—(see *Tense*) and *Formation of Adjectives* under *Adjectives*.

Permissives—198.

Pharchi—to clean. Idiomatic use of—in compounds—195, 196.

Possession—(see *Ownership*).

Possibility—denoted by Passive Voice—163.

Postpositions—definition and general functions of—33; functions of—in con-
nexion with Nouns and Pronouns—33 to 64; functions
of—in connexion with bare Tense forms—(see *Clause*).

Predication, theory of—*Introd.*, XXXIII to LIV.

division of Predicates into two categories stated and explained—*Introd.*
XLI to XLIII.

existence, presence and possession treated in Mundari as concepts
distinct from the concepts of substance and accident
—XLIV to XLVI.

Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, meaning attached to the term
and reason for substituting it for the term Verb—*Introd.*
LIV (III).

Prefixes—(see *Roots*).

Presence rendered by *mend* or by an idiomatic use of Nouns and Adverbs of
Place—*Introd.*, XLIV, XLV and *Gr.*, 172, 173.

Present—(see *Tense*).

Price—denoted by *re*—34 (3); by *red* or *ren*—88; by *te*—37 (c).

Priority—denoted by *le* (see *Anterior Tenses* under *Tense*); by *te*—208; by
chi—208; by *red*—209.

Pronouns: their generic function as demonstrative roots—*Introd.*, XVI.

Simple Personal Pronouns: their form, functions and position—
12 to 26.

Pronouns—concluded.

Simple Personal Pronouns as Possessive affixes—98 (3rd), to 101.

Origin and meaning of—20 to 26.

Impersonal Pronoun—(see A and a).

Emphatic Pronouns: their form, functions and position—16, 17.

Reasons for considering them as compound forms—17 to 19.

Definite Demonstrative Pronouns—26 to 28.

Indefinite—28 to 30.

Definite Interrogative—30, 31.

Indefinite Interrogative—31, 32.

Pronunciation—1 to 5.

Proposition—Definition and explanation of the term—*Introd. XXXII to*

XXXV. Intrapositional relations distinct from the abstractions embodied in Organic Parts of Speech—Introd., XXIII and XXXV.

Method of connoting the relation between Subject and Predicate in Organic languages—Introd., XXXV to XXXVII;—in Mundari, XXXVII to XLVIII.

Method of connoting the relation between Predicates and their Objects in Organic languages—Introd., XLVIII, XLIX;—in Mundari, XLIX to LIII.

Other intrapositional relations—LII to LV.

Unity or simplicity of the Mundari Proposition—LV, LVI.

Co-ordination of complete propositions used to render the so-called *oratio obliqua* or Indirect Speech-form—LVI, LVII.

Questions used to make up for deficiency of Relative Pronouns—31 (3),—of Ordinal Numerals—67.

Recognition—Various idiomatic constructions used to render the verb *to recognize*—193.

Reduplication—Functions of—in Mundari—113 and 182.

Reflexive—Voice—(see *Voice*).

Reflexive Pronouns—17 (I. N.B.) and 32.

Refusal—expressed by the transitive and intransitive use of *ka*—175.

Relations—Intrapositional—(see *Proposition*).

—of time and space—(see *Postpositions and Clause*).

Moral—(see *Genitive and Dative under Case*).

Relative Pronouns—31, 32.

Religion of Mundas, a system made up of three distinct cults—*Introd., VI.*

Worship Singbonga—VI (I) to VII (II).

Ancestor-worship—VII (II) to X (III).

Local deities or bongako—X (III).

Sacrificers: (1) Pahayr—X (III); (2) head of family—XI; (3) Ondoka or minister of human sacrifices—XI, XII.

Legend on which the worship of local deities is based—Appendix.

The Karam-kahani, not a Mundari legend—XI.

Repetition expressed by reduplication—182; by *orô*—*Introd., XXI, XXII.*

Roots as distinct from words—*Introd., II, III and XVI.*

Predicative—Definition of—XVI.

Objects—concluded.

Reason for preserving original forms in the inserted Objects.—18 (4h).

Insertion of Pronominal Objects causing phonetic changes in Tense-Suffixes
—138, 140, 143 (VIII), 145 (X), 146, 164 (*ked* and
akad).

Order of words in the Proposition. Functions performed generally by—
Introd., XXXV.

Ownership as distinguished in Mundari from other relations—70 to 90.

Participles as distinct from *bare Tense-forms* in Organic languages—XXVII.

—————identical with *bare Tense-forms* in Mundari—XXVII, XXVIII.

Participial clauses in Mundari—(see *Clause*).

Parts of Speech in Organic languages—*Introd.*, XVII to XX; —in Mundari—
XX to XXII.

Passive—(see *Voice*).

Past—(see *Tense*).

Patronymics—Formation of—94 to 97; —as Transitive and Intransitive
Predicates—218, 219.

Peré—to fill. Idiomatic use of—in compounds—195.

Perfect—(see *Tense*) and *Formation of Adjectives* under *Adjectives*.

Permissives—198.

Pharchi—to clean. Idiomatic use of—in compounds—195, 196.

Possession—(see *Ownership*).

Possibility—denoted by Passive Voice—163.

Postpositions—definition and general functions of—33; functions of—in con-
nexion with Nouns and Pronouns—33 to 64; functions
of—in connexion with bare Tense forms—(see *Clause*).

Predication, theory of—*Introd.*, XXXIII to LIV.

division of Predicates into two categories stated and explained—*Introd.*
XLI to XLIII.

existence, presence and possession treated in Mundari as concepts
distinct from the concepts of substance and accident
—XLIV to XLVI.

Transitive and Intransitive Predicates, meaning attached to the term
and reason for substituting it for the term Verb—*Introd.*
LIV (III).

Prefixes—(see *Roots*).

Presence rendered by *mené* or by an idiomatic use of Nouns and Adverbs of
Place—*Introd.*, XLIV, XLV and Gr., 172, 173.

Present—(see *Tense*).

Price—denoted by *re*—34 (3); by *red* or *ren*—38; by *te*—37 (c).

Priority—denoted by *le* (see *Anterior Tenses* under *Tense*); by *te*—208; by
chi—208; by *red*—209.

Pronouns: their generic function as demonstrative roots—*Introd.*, XVI.

Simple Personal Pronouns: their form, functions and position—
12 to 26.

Pronouns—concluded.*Simple Personal Pronouns* as Possessive affixes—93 (3rd.) to 101.*Origin and meaning of*—20 to 26.*Impersonal Pronoun*—(see A and a).*Emphatic Pronouns*: their form, functions and position—16, 17.*Reasons for considering them as compound forms*—17 to 19.*Definite Demonstrative Pronouns*—26 to 28.*Indefinite*—28 to 30.*Definite Interrogative*—30, 31.*Indefinite Interrogative*—31, 32.**Pronunciation**—1 to 5.**Proposition**—Definition and explanation of the term—*Introd.* XXXIII toXXXV. *Intrapositional relations* distinct from the abstractions embodied in Organic Parts of Speech—*Introd.*, XXIII and XXXV.*Method of connoting the relation between Subject and Predicate in Organic languages*—*Introd.*, XXXV to XXXVII;—in *Mundari*, XXXVII to XLVIII.*Method of connoting the relation between Predicates and their Objects in Organic languages*—*Introd.*, XLVIII, XLIX;—in *Mundari*, XLIX to LIII.*Other intrapositional relations*—LII to LV.*Unity or simplicity of the Mundari Proposition*—LV, LVI.**Co-ordination of complete propositions** used to render the so-called *oratio obliqua* or Indirect Speech-form—LVI, LVII.**Questions** used to make up for deficiency of Relative Pronouns—31 (3),—of Ordinal Numerals—67.**Recognition**—Various idiomatic constructions used to render the verb *to recognize*—193.**Reduplication**—Functions of—in *Mundari*—113 and 182.**Reflexive**—*Voice*—(see *Voice*).**Reflexive Pronouns**—17 (1. N.B.) and 32.**Refusal**—expressed by the transitive and intransitive use of *ka*—175.**Relations**—*Intrapositional*—(see *Proposition*).—of time and space—(see *Postpositions* and *Clause*).*Moral*—(see *Genitive* and *Dative* under *Case*).**Relative Pronouns**—31, 32.**Religion of Mundas**, a system made up of three distinct cults—*Introd.*, VI.*Worship Singhonga*—VI (I) to VII (II).*Ancestor-worship*—VII (II) to X (III).*Local deities or bongoko*—X (III).*Sacrificers*: (1) *Pahanr*—X (III); (2) *head of family*—XI; (3) *Ondoka* or *minister of human sacrifices*—XI, XII.*Legend* on which the worship of local deities is based—Appendix.*The Karam-kahani*, not a *Mundari* legend—XI.**Repetition** expressed by reduplication—182; by *oro*—*Introd.*, XXI, XXII.**Roots** as distinct from words—*Introd.*, II, III and XVI.**Predicative**—Definition of—XVI.

Roots—concluded.

Demonstrative Definition of—XVI.

Bare-roots contrasted with Parts of Speech—XVII to XXXIII.

Sentence—(see *Proposition*).

See generally not connoted in Mundari—5;—how connoted in particular cases—7.

Scheme of Cases—92 to 95;—*of Voices and Tenses*—161.

Soul, spirit or shade—(see *Ancestor-worship* under *Religion*).

Strengthening of initial syllable by the aspirate (h) function attached to it—10 (Note 1).

Subject—(see *Predication* and *Proposition*).

Subordination of secondary to primary elements in Organic languages.—*Introd.* II, III; in *Agglutinative languages*—III, IV.

Substance—(see *Predication*).

Suffixes—*Introd.*, IV.

Tense—Definition of the term *bare Tense-form*—119.

Functional differences between bare Tense-forms in Organic languages and in Mundari—119 to 129.

Formation and functions of the Mundari Tenses—134 to 152.

Indeterminate—134.

Simple Future—135 to 137.

Static Future—137.

Anterior Future—137 to 139.

Definite Present—139.

Indefinite—139, 140. *Distinction between*—*and Definite*—140 to 142.

Continuative—143.

Simple Past—143, 144.

Incomplete—144.

Anterior—145.

Static—145, 146.

Indefinite—147.

Perfect—146.

Imperfect—149 to 152.

Origin and meaning of Tense-Suffixes—162 to 166.

Tense-forms used as Relative Clauses and as Circumstantial Clauses of Time, Place, Manner, etc. (see *Clause*).

Terminology (grammatical)—*Introd.*, LVII, LVIII.

Transitivity—Definition of—161 (under *ked* and *a-kad*).

Universal truths—Tense used to state—(see *Indeterminate Tense* under *Tense*).

Verb—Definition of Organic Verbs—*Introd.*, XVI. No exact counterpart of Verbs in Mundari—LIV (III). Comparison of Organic Verbs with Mundari Transitive and Intransitive Predicates (see *Conjugation*).

Vocative—(see *Case*).

Voice—Definition of—130, 131. Formation and functions of—

Active—133.

Passive—152.

Reflexive—155.

Reciprocal—157.

Vowels—(see *Alphabet*).

Vowel-changes—used to modify the meaning of roots—10 (Note 1), 37 (Note),
38 (Note), 153, 154, 163 (*ken*), 165 (*len*).

Witches and wizards—Abuses connected with the superstitious belief in—
Introd., XII.

Words as distinct from roots—(see *Roots*).

L. D. S.
